arXiv:1302.4058v1 [math.OA] 17 Feb 2013

THE QUANTUM GROMOV-HAUSDORFF PROPINQUITY

FRÉDÉRIC LATRÉMOLIÈRE

Abstract. We introduce the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity, a new distance between quantum compact metric spaces, which extends the Gromov-Hausdorff distance to noncommutative geometry and strengthens Rieffel's quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance and Rieffel's proximity by making *-isomorphism a necessary condition for distance zero, while being well adapted to Leibniz seminorms. We prove that quantum tori form a continuous family for our quantum propinquity, and that they can be approximated by finite dimensional C*-algebras as well, though these results require different proofs from our previous theorems for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance. This work offers a natural framework for the development of a theory of Leibniz Lip-norms over C*-algebras.

1. Introduction

Noncommutative metric geometry is the study of noncommutative generalizations of algebras of Lipschitz functions on metric spaces. A fascinating consequence of the introduction of noncommutative metric data on C*-algebras, encoded in special seminorms called Lip-norms, is the possibility to define topologies on quantum metric spaces, which in turn establishes a framework for new forms of approximations and the development of new techniques inspired, in large part, by the mathematical physics literature. In this paper, we introduce a new distance between quantum compact metric spaces, motivated by the challenge to incorporate the C*-algebraic structure as a component of our hypertopology, and in particular, to provide an appropriate foundation for the metric study of C*-metric spaces. We offer a solution to the long standing problem regarding the construction of a distance which is well-behaved for the class of quantum compact metric spaces whose Lip-norms satisfy the Leibniz identity, which includes all important examples of quantum compact metric spaces and whose importance has grown with the recent progress in research in noncommutative metric geometry. We demonstrate that our distance dominates Rieffel's quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance, is dominated by the Gromov-Hausdorff distance when restricted to classical metric spaces, and can be seen as a well-behaved form of Rieffel's proximity, from which it takes its name. We then prove that quantum tori form a continuous family for the quantum propinquity, and that they can be approximated by finite dimensional C*-algebras, which require very significant changes to our proof of a similar result for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance. In this introduction,

---

Date: February 19, 2013.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46L89, 46L30, 58B34.

Key words and phrases. Noncommutative metric geometry, Gromov-Hausdorff convergence, Monge-Kantorovich distance, Quantum Metric Spaces, Lip-norms, Quantum Tori, Finite dimensional approximations.

we shall place this paper within the larger literature on the subject by distinguishing our new distance from other constructions and comparing our new results on quantum tori with existing research.

A *compact quantum metric space* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$, as defined by Rieffel [31, 32] is a pair of an order unit-space $\mathfrak{A}$ and a densely defined seminorm on $\mathfrak{A}$, called a Lip-norm, whose dual seminorm induces a metric on the state space $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ whose topology is the weak* topology. The classical picture is given by a pair $(C(X), \mathsf{Lip})$ of the algebra of $\mathbb{R}$-valued continuous functions on a compact metric space (X, d) equipped with the Lipschitz seminorm Lip associated with the metric d. Noncommutative examples include the quantum tori and other quantum homogeneous spaces [31], hyperbolic group C*-algebras [28], Dubois-Voilette quantum spheres [24], among others. We generalized this structure to quantum locally compact metric spaces in [22].

Rieffel introduces his *quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance* in [40], as a generalization of the Gromov-Hausdorff distance [11, 12] to compact quantum metric spaces. He showed, as a first example, that quantum tori formed a continuous family for this metric. The construction of the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance proceeds as follows: given two compact quantum metric spaces $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, we consider the set $\mathrm{Adm}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ of all Lip-norms on $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$ whose quotients to $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are, respectively, $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. For any such admissible Lip-norm L, one may consider the Hausdorff distance between $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$ identified with their isometric copies in $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$, where the state spaces $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$, $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$ and $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$ are equipped with the metrics dual to, respectively, $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ and L. The infimum of these Hausdorff distances over all possible choices of $\mathsf{L} \in \mathrm{Adm}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ is the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance between $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$.

As an example of an interesting application of this distance, we proved in [20] that we can also use Rieffel's metric to approximate quantum tori by finite dimensional C*-algebras. Our work was motivated by such papers in mathematical physics as [6, 27, 41, 26], where such finite approximations of quantum tori surfaced without any formal framework. Of course, quantum tori are not AF algebras — rather, the closest form of approximation of this nature, due to Elliott and Evans, is that irrational rotation algebras, i.e. two dimensional simple quantum tori, are AT algebras, or inductive limits of circle algebras [8]. Thus our work was the first construction to provide some evidence that the intuition often encountered in mathematical physics could be formalized. Later on, other examples of convergence results for Rieffel's metric were established regarding Dubois-Voilette quantum spheres [25] and finite dimensional approximations of coadjoint orbits of compact Lie groups [34, 36].

The choice to forget the multiplicative structure (or at least, some of it, as the Jordan products can still be recovered [1]) by working with order-unit spaces rather than C*-algebras, allowed for very useful constructions on which a lot of convergence results mentioned above relied, including our own [20]. Yet, the price for this choice is that Rieffel's distance may be null between two non-isomorphic C*-algebras, as long as they are both isomorphic as order-unit spaces and their quantum metric space structures are isometric in a well-defined sense [40]. This weakened form of the desirable coincidence property has sparked quite some efforts geared toward strengthening Rieffel's metric [16, 17, 23, 25]. In all of these approaches, the principle is to replace the state space with an object more connected to the C*-algebraic structure, such as unital matrix-valued completely positive maps [16, 17], or the restriction of the multiplication graph to the Lipschitz ball [23]. In general, new techniques need to be devised to show that sequences which converge in the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance converge in these metrics, as they are stronger. However, it is not always clear what these techniques may be, as discussed for instance at the end of [35, Section 2]. It was not immediately apparent which construction may fit the future development of the theory best.

As a parallel development within the field, the importance of the C*-algebraic structure became evident as the field of noncommutative metric geometry grew. Rieffel's work on convergence for vector bundles [37], and our own generalization of the notion of quantum metric spaces to the quantum locally compact metric spaces setup [21, 22], are two such evidences. Concretely, the requirement that Lip-norms satisfy a strong form of the Leibniz identity has emerged and generated a large effort to recast previous convergence results for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance within this more stringent framework. Rieffel introduced the class of *compact C*-metric spaces* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$, as pairs of a unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ and a densely defined seminorm on $\mathfrak{A}$ whose restriction to the self-adjoint part $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ is a Lip-norm, and which satisfies, among various technical requirements, that for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}$:

$$\mathsf{L}(ab) \leqslant \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(b) + \|b\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(b) \tag{1.1}$$

while, if $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ is invertible:

$$\mathsf{L}\left(a^{-1}\right) \leqslant \left\|a^{-1}\right\|_{\mathfrak{A}}^{2} \mathsf{L}(a), \tag{1.2}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is the norm of $\mathfrak{A}$. The property described by Equation (1.1) is the *Leibniz condition*, whereas together, Equations (1.1) and (1.2) define what Rieffel calls the *strong Leibniz condition* [36]. These additional requirements define a natural class of C*-metric spaces, and by keeping the multiplicative structure encoded, they provide a natural framework for noncommutative metric geometry. Much effort has since been devoted to understanding Leibniz seminorms and their metric implications (for instance, [37, 36, 38, 39]). We expect that some form of the Leibniz property will play a role in the theory of quantum locally compact metric spaces, which started our own investigations in these matters, resulting in this paper.

There are two fascinating difficulties with this new approach. First, most original proofs of convergence for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance involved, at some point, the use of a Lip-norm which failed to be a strong Leibniz seminorm, or even a Leibniz seminorm — in fact, in the case of quantum tori, much work is done on order-unit spaces which are not the full self-adjoint part of a C*-algebra. Indeed, to establish the continuity of the family of quantum tori for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance, a particular construction, involving continuous fields of states, leads to a Lip-norm which fails to be Leibniz [40, Proposition 11.1]. These fields are constructed to deal with the varying norms between different quantum tori. The same construction played a similar role in our own work on finite dimensional approximations of quantum tori [20]. Thus, if one wishes to work within the context of C*-algebras and (strong) Leibniz seminorms, then some very non-trivial changes must be made. An example of the difficulties involved can be found in [36], which replaces all non-Leibniz Lip-norms in [34] involved in the proof of convergence of matrix algebras to co-adjoint orbits of Lie groups for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance, with strong Leibniz Lip-norms built using bimodules. This problem provided us with a motivation for the present work with the quantum tori, in order to answer what would be the tasks required to remove non-Leibniz seminorms from our original proof. As we shall see, this is a rather involved matter.

A second, deeper difficulty, regards the proper theoretical framework to work with C*-metric spaces, or more generally, with quantum compact metric spaces whose Lip-norm possess a form of the Leibniz property. A natural idea could be to require, in the definition of the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance which we discussed above, that all admissible Lip-norms should be strong Leibniz themselves, and proceed with the construction without changes. Such an approach led Rieffel to define the *proximity* between compact C*-metric spaces in [36]. However, this quantity is not proven to be metric, and in fact, is unlikely to be so. The main difficulty is to prove the triangle inequality. Consequently, even if one proves convergence of a sequence of compact C*-metric spaces to some limit for Rieffel's proximity, it is unclear whether the sequence is Cauchy, and this leads to intriguing questions [35]. This is not the first time such problems occur: Kerr already faced this problem in [16]. The main problem can be summarized in the fact that the quotient of a Leibniz seminorm is not always a Leibniz seminorm, as was already known in [3]. This pathology in the behavior of Leibniz seminorms makes it extremely difficult to find out a proper metric between compact C*-metric spaces. Some past suggestions [23] could prove useful, but working with them has proven quite difficult as well (see [35, Section 2]). The problem, it would seem, is that there is a gap between the sort of Leibniz Lip-norms one constructs in practice, and any available metric on quantum compact metric spaces.

We offer a solution to this second problem in the present paper. We propose a new distance, the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity, which we intend to play the role for which Rieffel's proximity was introduced, with three very remarkable benefits. First, our quantum propinquity satisfies the triangle inequality by construction. Second, it is an actual distance on compact C*-metric spaces: distance zero implies *-isomorphism and, of course, isometry of the quantum metric space structures. Third, our quantum propinquity is constructed to take full advantage of the methods developed to work with strong Leibniz Lip-norms. To be a little more specific, given two compact quantum metric spaces $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, the construction of an admissible Lip-norm L for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, since the beginning of the research in this field [40], typically involves finding a seminorm N on $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$, called a bridge [40, Section 5], with sufficient properties so that:

$$(a,b) \in \mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B} \longmapsto \max\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b), \mathsf{N}(a,b)\}$$

is an admissible Lip-norm. When $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ are compact C*-metric spaces, it is natural to make the same sort of construction, looking for bridges which satisfy the proper version of the strong Leibniz property. Rieffel's original proposition [36] is to choose an $\mathfrak{A}$-$\mathfrak{B}$-bimodule, with the actions of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ non-degenerate, an element $\omega \in \Omega$, and a bimodule norm $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$ on Ω (i.e. for all $a \in \mathfrak{A}, b \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $\eta \in \Omega$ we have $\|a\eta b\|_\Omega \leqslant \|a\|_\mathfrak{A}\|\eta\|_\Omega\|b\|_\mathfrak{B}$). Then one could try to build a bridge of the form:

$$\mathsf{N}_{\Omega,\omega} : (a,b) \in \mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B} \longmapsto \gamma\|a\omega - \omega b\|_\Omega$$

for some strictly positive scalar γ.

While very natural, this idea requires, in order to work, a non-trivial choice of bimodule, and to relate what being small in the sense of the seminorm $\mathsf{N}_{\Omega,\omega}$ implies on the distance between state spaces. Both of these issues can present major challenges.

One may prefer to replace general bimodules in the above construction with C*-algebras, both for technical practicality and for the elegance to work only within the category of C*-algebras. This is particularly sensible if one would wish to preserve the multiplicative structure of compact C*-metric spaces through convergence, in some sense. It is possible to do so in some known examples [35], and again, this presents interesting problems.

In our present paper, we use the idea of the construction of bridges based on bimodules which are themselves C*-algebras as our starting point. Thus, our quantum propinquity is very much motivated, not only by the theoretical need to provide a consistent framework for metric noncommutative geometry of compact C*-metric spaces, but also by the practical matter of being applicable to known and future examples.

Thus, in summary, this paper proposes a new distance, called the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity, which is designed as a natural distance to work with compact C*-metric spaces, and dominates Rieffel's quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance. We hope that our work presents a solution to the long standing problem of working with Leibniz seminorms in the context of noncommutative metric geometry, while remaining practical. Our paper is organized in two sections. In a first section, we introduce the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity, thus named for its relation, in spirit, with Rieffel's proximity. This section first defines the category in which we shall work, which is a subcategory of Rieffel's compact quantum metric spaces where all the underlying order-unit spaces are in fact the self-adjoint part of unital C*-algebras (rather than some subspace of it) and all the Lip-norms satisfy a Leibniz inequality and are lower semi-continuous. Then, we define our new distance and prove that it satisfies all the required axioms to be a metric. The proof of the coincidence property is the central piece of this section. We also show that the quantum propinquity dominates the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance, thus providing a natural interpretation to our distance. We conclude this first section by showing that the Gromov-Hausdorff distance dominates our quantum propinquity restricted to classical compact metric spaces.

In the second section of this paper, we prove continuity and convergence results for quantum tori and fuzzy tori. The work in this paper complements, rather than replaces, our work in [20], as our focus is the introduction of the new techniques required to work with our quantum propinquity, while we make full use of prior techniques used in [20]. This section starts with introducing quantum tori and fuzzy tori and the basic results we need, including the essential parts from [20]. We then construct a family of bridges, in the sense used in the first section, and prove our main convergence result. We expect that our proof will serve as a blue print for proofs regarding convergences for our quantum propinquity.

2. THE QUANTUM GROMOV-HAUSDORFF PROPINQUITY

This section constructs our *quantum Gromov-Hausdorff Propinquity* on isometry classes of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, which are compact quantum metric spaces whose underlying spaces are described by C*-algebras endowed with particular types of seminorms with the Leibniz property. We introduce first the category of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, and then present our new metric, whose main qualities are that *-isomorphism of the underlying C*-algebras of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces is necessary for our distance to be zero, while it dominates the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance and is built around the concept of Leibniz Lip-norms.

2.1. Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces.

We shall use the following notations throughout our paper:

Notation 2.1. We denote the self-adjoint part of any C*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ by $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, and the unit of a unital C*-algebra as $1_{\mathfrak{A}}$. The norm of any space V is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_V$ by default.

At the root of our work is a pair of C*-algebra and a seminorm enjoying various properties. We start with the most minimal assumptions on such pairs and introduce the context of our paper:

Definition 2.2. A *unital Lipschitz pair* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ and a seminorm L defined on a dense subspace of $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that:

$$\{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathsf{L}(a) = 0\} = \mathbb{R}1_{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

Whenever convenient, we shall see the seminorm L of a unital Lipschitz pair $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ as defined on $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, with the following convention:

Convention 2.3. If L is a densely defined seminorm on a space $\mathfrak{A}$, then we may regard L as a generalized seminorm on $\mathfrak{A}$ by setting $\mathsf{L}(a) = \infty$ for $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ not in the domain of L. We shall adopt this convention whenever convenient without further mention. Moreover, we adopt the measure-theoretic convention regarding computations with ∞, namely: $r\infty = \infty r = \infty$ for all $r \in (0, \infty]$ while $0\infty = \infty 0 = 0$, and $r + \infty = \infty + r = \infty$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

When necessary, we shall refer to the domain of the seminorm in a Lipschitz pair:

Notation 2.4. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ be a unital Lipschitz pair. The *domain of* L is the set:

$$\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}) = \{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathsf{L}(a) < \infty\}.$$

At the core of noncommutative geometry are the quantum metric spaces, defined in [31, 32] by Rieffel in the compact case, and generalized by the present author to the locally compact setup in [22]. This paper, though inspired by our work on the latter, is concerned with the former. In either situation, the metric data encoded by a Lipschitz pair is reflected by the following distance on the state space of the underlying C*-algebra:

Notation 2.5. The *state space* of a C*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ is denoted by $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$.

Definition 2.6. The *Monge-Kantorovich metric* associated with a unital Lipschitz pair $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is the distance mk_{L} defined on the state space $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ as:

$$\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}} : \varphi, \psi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}) \longmapsto \sup\{|\varphi(a) - \psi(a)| : a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) \text{ and } \mathsf{L}(a) \leqslant 1\}.$$

Definition (2.2) of a unital Lipschitz pair is designed precisely so that the associated Monge-Kantorovich metric is, indeed, a metric, as one can easily check. This metric has a long history and many names, and could fairly be called the Monge-Kantorovich-Rubinstein-Wasserstein-Dobrushin metric. It finds its roots in the transportation problem introduced in 1781 by Monge, which was later studied by Kantorovich, who introduced this metric [14] in 1940. The form we use was first given in 1958 by Kantorovich and Rubinstein [15]. In the context of probability theory, Wasserstein later re-introduced this same metric in 1969 [42]. Dobrushin [7] named this metric after Wasserstein, and also studied the properties of this metric in the noncompact setting, which was fundamental to our work [22]. Connes suggested in [4, 5] to use Definition (2.6) to study metric properties in noncommutative geometry, when L is the seminorm associated with a spectral triple. Our choice of terminology is somewhat arbitrary, based loosely on the order of appearance of this metric, and in line with Rieffel's terminology, when he introduced the more general setup of Lip-norms which we use in this paper.

The fundamental idea of Rieffel [31, 32] is to match the topology induced by the Monge-Kantorovich metric to the natural topology on the state space:

Definition 2.7. A *quantum compact metric space* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a unital Lipschitz pair such that the associated Monge-Kantorovich metric mk_{L} induces the weak* topology on the state space $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ of $\mathfrak{A}$. If $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a quantum compact metric space, then L is called a *Lip norm* on $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$.

The fundamental example, and motivation behind Rieffel's definition, is the classical picture given by compact metric spaces:

Example 2.8. Let (X, d) be a compact metric space. For any function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$, we define the *Lipschitz constant of f* as:

$$\mathsf{L}(f) = \sup\left\{ \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\mathsf{d}(x, y)} : x, y \in X, x \neq y \right\}.$$

Arzéla-Ascoli's Theorem shows that the set $\{f : f(x_0) = 0 \text{ and } \mathsf{L}(f) \leqslant 1\}$ is norm compact, for any $x_0 \in X$, and the algebra of real-valued functions with finite Lipschitz constant is dense in $\mathfrak{sa}(C(X))$ by Stone-Weierstrass theorem, where $C(X)$ is the C*-algebra of $\mathbb{C}$-valued continuous functions on X. From these two observations, one proves that the Monge-Kantorovich metric mk_{L}, which is the original

Monge-Kantorovich distance, metrizes the weak* topology on the space of Radon probability measures on X, which is naturally identified with the state space of $C(X)$.

Another example which will prove important to us in this paper is given by quantum homogeneous spaces, and was established by Rieffel at the very start of the study of compact quantum metric spaces:

Example 2.9. [31] Let G be a compact group and l be a continuous length function on G. Let e be the identity element of G. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a unital C*-algebra and $g \in G \mapsto \alpha^g$ be a strongly continuous action of G on $\mathfrak{A}$, which is *ergodic* in the sense that:

$$\bigcap_{g\in G} \{a \in \mathfrak{A} : \alpha^g(a) = a\} = \mathbb{C}1_{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

Define for all $a \in \mathfrak{A}$:

$$\mathsf{L}(a) = \sup\left\{ \frac{\|\alpha^g(a) - a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}}{l(g)} : g \in G \setminus \{e\} \right\},$$

where $\mathsf{L}(a)$ may be infinite. Then [31, Theorem 2.3] proves that L is a indeed a Lip-norm on $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$. This result employs the deep fact that ergodic actions of compact groups on C*-algebras have finite dimensional spectral subspaces [13], and is therefore very nontrivial.

As seen with Example (2.9), proving that a given Lipschitz pair is a quantum compact metric space is in general difficult. Connes suggested to use Definition (2.6) for a spectral triple $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathscr{H}, D)$ [5] by setting $\mathsf{L}(a) = \|[D, \pi(a)]\|$ where the norm is the operator norm (allowing for ∞), π is the representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ on $\mathscr{H}$ chosen for this spectral triple, and D is the "Dirac operator" of the triple. In particular, this metric recovers the Riemannian metric on a spin manifold when D is chosen to be the actual associated Dirac operator. Rieffel showed in [31, Theorem 4.2] that the standard spectral triple on quantum tori provides examples of Lip-norms as well. In [4], Connes constructed a spectral triple over C*-algebras $C^*(G)$ of discrete groups G endowed with some length function. Ozawa and Rieffel proved in [28] that such a spectral triple construction does lead to a quantum compact metric space when G is hyperbolic and the length function is the word-length function for a given set of generators. Rieffel proved in [33] that this construction also works for $G = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and for quantum tori (i.e. twisted C*-algebras $C^*(\mathbb{Z}^d, \sigma)$ for 2-cocycles σ, see the second section of this paper for an introduction of these C*-algebras). The latter paper used Connes' cosphere algebra, for instance. The situation for more general groups, let alone more general spectral triples, is open, with only a few other known specific examples. In [22], we show how the Moyal plane can be seen as a quantum locally compact metric space with the proper definition by using the spectral triple introduced in [10].

Remark 2.10. Rieffel's *compact quantum metric spaces* are pairs $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ where $\mathfrak{A}$ is an order unit space, and L is a densely defined seminorm on $\mathfrak{A}$ which vanishes exactly on the scalar multiple of the order unit of $\mathfrak{A}$, such that the Monge-Kantorovich metric defined by Definition (2.6), where $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ is meant for the state space of $\mathfrak{A}$ as an order unit space, metrizes the weak* topology of $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ [31, 32]. We shall only work in this paper in the context where the order-unit spaces are, in fact, the set of all self-adjoints elements of a unital C*-algebra. As our definition is a special case of Rieffel's, we employ a slightly different terminology, where we inverse the order of the words *quantum* and *compact*, in line with our own terminology in [22].

Remark 2.11. If $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a quantum compact metric space, then the weak* topology of $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ is metrizable, and one easily check that this implies in turn that $\mathfrak{A}$ is separable.

A form of Arzéla-Ascoli theorem serves as the main characterization of quantum compact metric spaces. It first appeared in [31], at the very root of this theory of quantum metric spaces. We present here an equivalent formulation which first appeared in [28], and which we generalized to the locally compact setting in [22, Theorem 3.10]:

Theorem 2.12. [28] *Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ be a unital Lipschitz pair. The following are equivalent:*

1. *$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a quantum compact metric space,*
2. *There exists $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that the set:*
$$\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}, \varphi) = \{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \varphi(a) = 0 \text{ and } \mathsf{L}(a) \leqslant 1\}$$
is totally bounded for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{A}}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$,
3. *For all $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$, the set:*
$$\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}, \varphi) = \{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \varphi(a) = 0 \text{ and } \mathsf{L}(a) \leqslant 1\}$$
is totally bounded for the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{A}}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a notion of distance on a class of quantum compact metric spaces in such a way that, among other properties, two quantum compact metric spaces are at distance zero only if their underlying C*-algebras are *-isomorphic. To this end, we impose further conditions on Lip-norms to control their behavior with respect to multiplication. To keep our framework general, and because of inherent difficulties with Lipschitz seminorms of complex functions (see, in particular, [36, Example 5.4]), we actually work within the Jordan-Lie-algebra of self-adjoint elements:

Notation 2.13. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a C*-algebra and $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}$. The *Jordan product* $\frac{1}{2}(ab + ba)$ is denoted by $a \circledcirc b$. We denote the *Lie product* $\frac{1}{2i}(ab - ba) = \frac{1}{2i}[a, b]$ of a and b by $[a, b]_*$. Thus $(\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}), \cdot \circledcirc \cdot, [\cdot, \cdot]_*)$ is a Jordan-Lie algebra [19, Definition 1.1.2]; in particular it is closed under the Jordan product and the Lie product. (We use a slightly different Lie product from [19].)

Definition 2.14. A unital Lipschitz pair $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ has the *Leibniz property*, or equivalently is called a *unital Leibniz pair*, when for $a, b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, we have:

$$\mathsf{L}(a \circledcirc b) = \mathsf{L}\left(\frac{ab + ba}{2}\right) \leqslant \left(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} \mathsf{L}(b) + \|b\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \mathsf{L}(a)\right)$$

and

$$\mathsf{L}([a, b]_*) = \mathsf{L}\left(\frac{ab - ba}{2i}\right) \leqslant \left(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} \mathsf{L}(b) + \|b\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \mathsf{L}(a)\right).$$

Remark 2.15. The domain of a Leibniz seminorm for a unital Lipschitz pair is always a Jordan-Lie algebra.

Thus, the seminorm of a unital Leibniz pair satisfies a form of the Leibniz inequality, albeit restricted to the Jordan product and the commutator. A natural and common source of examples of unital Leibniz pair is:

Proposition 2.16. *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a unital C*-algebra and L be a densely defined seminorm on $\mathfrak{A}$ whose domain is closed under the adjoint operation, such that $\{a \in \mathfrak{A} : \mathsf{L}(a) = 0\} = \mathbb{C}1_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and, for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, we have:*

$$\mathsf{L}(ab) \leqslant (\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(b) + \|b\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(a)) .$$

Then $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a unital Leibniz pair, identifying L with its restriction to $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$.

Proof. First, we note that if $a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, then a is the limit of a sequence $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the domain of L by assumption. Yet, since L is a seminorm and the domain of L is assumed self-adjoint, we conclude that $\left(\frac{a_n+a_n^*}{2}\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ lies within the domain of L, while still being a sequence in $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ which converges to a. Thus, the restriction of L to $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ has dense domain.

For all $a, b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{L}(a \circledcirc b) &= \mathsf{L}\left(\frac{1}{2}(ab + ba)\right)\\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left(2\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(b) + 2\|b\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(a)\right) = (\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(b) + \|b\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}(a)) ,\end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the Lie product. ☐

Example 2.17. The unital Lipschitz pairs defined in Examples (2.8,2.9) or constructed from spectral triples or derivations [5] are unital Leibniz pairs.

We now can present the objects of interest for this paper:

Definition 2.18. A *Leibniz quantum compact metric space* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ such that $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a unital Leibniz pair and L is lower semi-continuous. If $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ is a Leibniz quantum compact metric space, then we call L a Leibniz Lip-norm.

Example 2.19. Examples (2.8), 2.9, as those constructed, for instance, in [33, 28] are all Leibniz quantum compact metric space.

Remark 2.20. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$ be a Leibniz quantum compact metric space. As L is lower semi-continuous, the set $\{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathsf{L}(a) \leqslant 1 \text{ and } \varphi(a) = 0\}$ is closed, and as L is a Lip-norm, by Theorem (2.12), the set $\{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \varphi(a) = 0 \text{ and } \mathsf{L}(a) \leqslant 1\}$ is totally bounded, and thus compact, for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$. In turn, since $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}})$ is compact metric, and thus bounded by some constant $r \in \mathbb{R}$, one checks that the set $\{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} \leqslant r \text{ and } \mathsf{L}(a) \leqslant 1\}$ is norm compact in $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$. Thus L is a *closed* Lip-norm in the sense of [32, Definition 4.5]. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ is a C*-algebra, and thus $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ is always complete, Lip-norms are lower semi-continuous if and only if they are closed. The main advantage of closed Lip-norms is that they are uniquely determined by their associated Monge-Kantorovich metric [32, Theorem 4.1] and thus makes the notion of quantum isometry unambiguous. In our context, starting from Leibniz Lip-norm which is not lower semi-continuous, it is unclear whether the lower-semi-continuous Lip-norm one recovers by duality from the Monge-Kantorovich metric would be Leibniz. Thus our assumption is natural.

Remark 2.21. Rieffel introduces the class of *compact C*-metric spaces* in [36], which, using our terminology, are Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces with strong-Leibniz Lip-norms, rather than only Leibniz, and with additional requirements on the domains of the Lip-norms. Our work applies to this sub-class of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, as we shall work with bimodule bridges in the sense of [35], which allow one to construct strong Leibniz Lip-norms, if desired. On the other hand, the quantum propinquity is well-behaved within the context of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, and thus we take this preferred route for our exposition. We will discuss several variations of the quantum propinquity in this section, which we will call specialized quantum propinquities, which will include a specialization to compact C*-metric spaces.

We now return to the description of our category of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. We define our notions of morphisms for the objects we have introduced in Definition (2.18). In fact, the category consists of the natural restriction of the category of quantum compact metric spaces to the class of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces.

Definition 2.22. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two quantum compact metric spaces. A *quantum Lipschitz morphism* $\Phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a unital *-morphism from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$ such that its dual map $\mathscr{S}(\Phi) : \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ is a Lipschitz map from $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}})$ to $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}})$, where $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}$ (respectively $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}$) is the Monge-Kantorovich metric associated with $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ (respectively $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$).

It is an easy exercise to check that the composition of two quantum Lipschitz morphisms is a quantum Lipschitz morphism, where composition is the usual composition of *-morphisms. Thus, a quantum Lipschitz isomorphism is a *-isomorphism whose dual map is a bi-Lipschitz function between the state spaces metrized by their respective Monge-Kantorovich metrics. A special case of such quantum Lipschitz isomorphisms is given by:

Definition 2.23. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two quantum compact metric spaces. A *quantum isometric isomorphism* $\Phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a *-isomorphism from $\mathfrak{A}$ onto $\mathfrak{B}$ such that the dual map $\mathscr{S}(\Phi) : \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}) \rightarrow \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ is an isometry from $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}})$ onto $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}})$, where $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}$ (respectively $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}$) is the Monge-Kantorovich metric associated with $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ (respectively $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$).

It is useful to recall that, by [40, Theorem 6.2], we have the following characterization of quantum isometric isomorphisms:

Proposition 2.24. *Let* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ *and* $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ *be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. A *-isomorphism* $\Phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ *is a quantum isometric isomorphism if and only if* $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}} \circ \Phi = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Proof. Apply [40, Theorem 6.2], since $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ are closed by assumption (see Remark (2.20)). □

Proposition (2.24) is the justification for using only lower-semicontinuous Leibniz Lip-norms in this work.

The definition of the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance relies on the notion of a quantum metric subspace, which is a quotient object in the category of order-unit spaces, endowed with the quotient seminorm from a Lip-norm — which is itself a Lip-norm [40]. Unfortunately, the quotient of a Leibniz seminorm may not be Leibniz. This difficulty is discussed in [36], and was encountered before in noncommutative geometry (e.g. [16],[3]). Rieffel proposed in [36] a notion of compatibility between a seminorm and its quotient which would allow the Leibniz property to be inherited by quotient seminorm. However, even this additional condition does not appear natural in the category we have just defined. In general, sub-objects in noncommutative geometry are a challenge to define, and it would appear that Leibniz seminorms, which are tied to the C*-algebraic structures (unlike general Lip-norms) exhibit the same reluctance to localize to some "subspace" in general. Thus, we take a completely different approach, which simply does not need the notion of sub-object at all, and thus fits well within our noncommutative framework.

2.2. **The Quantum Gromov-Hausdorff Propinquity.** This section is the core of our paper, as it introduces and develops the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity. This distance on the quantum isometric isomorphic classes of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces is constructed directly from a notion of bridge, which are tools to construct new, Leibniz seminorms. As the Leibniz property is not well-behaved with respect to quotient, we avoid taking any quantum sub-object, and we also force the triangle inequality in our construction. In exchange, we place all the weight of our efforts on proving that our distance is zero exactly when two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces are quantum isometric isomorphic, while providing estimates on Rieffel's quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance and being dominated by the classical Gromov-Hausdorff distance on Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces given by Example (2.8).

As a preliminary tool for our work, we introduce the following notion.

Definition 2.25. The 1-*level* of an element $\omega \in \mathfrak{D}$ in a unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{D}$ is the set:

$$\mathscr{L}_1(\omega) = \left\{ \varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D}) \middle| \begin{array}{c} \varphi\left((1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)^*(1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)\right) = 0, \\ \varphi\left((1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)(1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)^*\right) = 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

A priori, the 1-level of an element may be empty, but we shall only be interested in elements with non-empty 1-level in our work. The key purpose of this set for us is the following lemma:

Lemma 2.26. *Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be a unital C*-algebra. A state $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D})$ belongs to the* 1*-level of some $\omega \in \mathfrak{D}$, if and only if for all $d \in D$, we have $\varphi(d) = \varphi(\omega d) = \varphi(d\omega)$.*

Proof. Assume that $\varphi \in \mathscr{L}_1(\omega)$. Let $d \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then, by Cauchy-Schwarz:

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi(d) - \varphi(d\omega)| &= |\varphi(d(1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega))| \\ &\leqslant \sqrt{\varphi(dd^*)\varphi((1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)^*(1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega))} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is identical to show that $\varphi(\omega d) = \varphi(d)$.

Conversely, assume given $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D})$ such that $\varphi(d) = \varphi(d\omega) = \varphi(d)$ for all $d \in \mathfrak{D}$. Then in particular, $1 = \varphi(1_{\mathfrak{D}}) = \varphi(\omega 1_{\mathfrak{A}}) = \varphi(\omega)$. Moreover, $\varphi(\omega^*\omega) = \varphi(\omega^*) = 1$. Thus:

$$\varphi((1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)^*(1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)) = 1 - \varphi(\omega) - \varphi(\omega^*) + \varphi(\omega^*\omega) = 0.$$

A similar computation shows $\varphi((1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)(1_{\mathfrak{D}} - \omega)^*) = 0$, so $\varphi \in \Sigma(\omega)$. □

Remark 2.27. Since, for any element ω of a unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{D}$, and for any state φ in its 1-level, we have $\varphi(\omega) = 1$, any element with non-empty 1-level has norm at least one.

The fundamental notion on which our construction relies is:

Definition 2.28. A *bridge* $(\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ from a unital C*-algebras $\mathfrak{A}$ to another unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ is a unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{D}$, an element $\omega \in \mathfrak{D}$ with non-empty 1-level, and two unital *-monomorphisms $\pi_{\mathfrak{A}} : \mathfrak{A} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ and $\pi_{\mathfrak{B}} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{D}$.

Notation 2.29. For any two unital C*-algebras $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, the set of all bridges from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$ is denoted by $\mathscr{B}\mathit{ridges}(\mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B})$.

Remark 2.30. The theory developed in this section would carry over if we changed the notion of bridge slightly to 4-tuples $(\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}), \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$, where $\mathscr{H}$ is a Hilbert space, $\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}$ are faithful non-degenerate *-representations of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, respectively, and ω is a possibly unbounded operator on $\mathscr{H}$ with non-empty 1-level set. On the other hand, we shall try, in our work, to minimize numerical quantities associated with bridges which, it would seem, would only get larger by allowing unbounded operators.

To any bridge between unital two C*-algebras, we can associate a seminorm:

Definition 2.31. The *norm of a bridge* $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ from a unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ to a unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ is the seminorm $\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(\cdot)$ on $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$ defined for all $(a, b) \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$ by:

$$\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(a, b) = \|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{D}}.$$

We check easily that, given two unital C*-algebras $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, for all $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$ and any bridge $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(ac, bd) &= \|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(ac)\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(bd)\|_{\mathfrak{D}} \\
&= \|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(c)\omega - \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(d) \\
&\quad + \pi_{A}(a)\omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(d) - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(d)\|_{\mathfrak{D}} \\
&\leqslant \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(c)\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(d)\|_{\mathfrak{D}} + \|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{D}}\|d\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \\
&= \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(c, d) + \mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(a, b)\|d\|_{\mathfrak{B}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(\cdot)$ satisfies a form of the Leibniz identity. Now, if $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ are two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, then the seminorm:

$$\mathsf{L}_r : (a, b) \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}) \longmapsto \max\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b), r\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(a, b)\}$$

is a Leibniz seminorm for all $r > 0$. With the right choice of r, the seminorm L_r is in fact an admissible Lip-norm for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, and thus $(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_r)$ becomes a

Leibniz quantum compact metric space which can be used to construct estimates for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance. This is the starting point for our idea of a new metric, and we will take advantage of this observation in Theorem (2.56) below. Furthermore, if $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ are strong Leibniz, then L_r can easily be checked to be strong Leibniz, by [36, Theorem 6.2]. This kind of strong Leibniz Lip-norm appears explicitly in [35]. Now, in the last paragraph of [35, Section 2], the challenge of using such Lip-norms to derive interesting estimates on Rieffel's proximity or Rieffel's quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance is raised. We propose a solution in this section.

The main question, now, is: given two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, how do we associate numerical values to a bridge as defined in Definition (2.28), such that these values provide estimates for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance?

A key ingredient to our constructions is given by:

Notation 2.32. For any Lipschitz pair $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L})$, we define:

$$\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}) = \{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathsf{L}(a) \leqslant 1\}.$$

We will also use the following notation often:

Notation 2.33. If $\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathfrak{D}$ are two unital C*-algebras, and $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ is a unital *-morphism of C*-algebra, we denote by $\mathscr{S}(\pi)$ the continuous affine map:

$$\mathscr{S}(\pi) : \varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D}) \longmapsto \varphi \circ \pi.$$

In particular, if $\pi : \mathfrak{A} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a *-monomorphism, then $\mathscr{S}(\pi) : \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ is a surjective weak* continuous affine map.

At the core of our construction is the notion of the *length* of a bridge between Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, which is build out of two numerical values, which we call the *reach* and the *height* of a bridge. We shall use:

Notation 2.34. For any metric space (E, d), the Hausdorff distance induced by d on the set of all compact subsets of E is denoted by h_{d}. If $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$ is a vector space and d is the distance induced by the norm on E, we denote h_{d} simply by $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_E}$.

As usual, if $E \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ for some algebra $\mathfrak{A}$, and $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, then $Ea = \{ea : e \in E\}$ and $aE = \{ae : e \in E\}$. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ be a Leibniz quantum compact metric space, let $\pi_{\mathfrak{A}} : \mathfrak{A} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ be a unital *-monomorphism from $\mathfrak{A}$ into some unital C*-algebra $\mathfrak{D}$, and let $\omega \in \mathfrak{D}$ be given. Let $\varphi_{\mathfrak{A}} \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ be fixed. Then, since $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is a closed Lip-norm, the set $\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}) = \{a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \leqslant 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = 0\}$ is compact in $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$. Consequently, the sets $\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}))\omega$ and $\omega\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}))$ are compact in $\mathfrak{D}$. Moreover, since the dual map $\mathscr{S}(\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}) : \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ is surjective, there exists $\psi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D})$ with $\psi \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{A}} = \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Now, let $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be another Leibniz quantum compact metric space, with a unital *-monomorphism $\pi_{\mathfrak{B}} : \mathfrak{B} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{D}$. Let $\varphi_{\mathfrak{B}} = \psi \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{B}}$ and note $\varphi_{\mathfrak{B}} \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$. Since $\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}))\omega$ and $\omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{B}}))$ are compact in norm in $\mathfrak{D}$, the Hausdorff distance between them is finite. Let us denote it by δ. Now, Let $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ with $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(b) \leqslant 1$ be given. Then there exists $a' \in \mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}})$ such that $\|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a')\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b - \varphi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b))\|_{\mathfrak{D}} \leqslant d$. Thus, if $a = a' + \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$, then we check that $\|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{D}} \leqslant d$.

As the situation is symmetric in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, we conclude that the Hausdorff distance between the sets $\{\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega : a \in \mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})\}$ and $\{\omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b) : b \in \mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})\}$ is finite. With this in mind, we define:

Definition 2.35. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. The *reach* of a bridge $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$ for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ is the non-negative real number $\varrho(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ defined by:

$$\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{D}}}\left(\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}\left(\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})\right)\omega, \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}\left(\mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})\right)\right).$$

Due to its central importance, we shall pause to provide a more explicit expression for the reach of a bridge. Let $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1)$ and $(\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces and let $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi_1, \pi_2, D)$ be a bridge between $\mathfrak{A}_1$ and $\mathfrak{A}_2$. For all $\{j, k\} = 1, 2$, we define $\rho_j(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ as:

$$\sup\{\inf\{\|\pi_1(a_1)\omega - \omega\pi_2(a_2)\|_{\mathfrak{D}} : a_k \in \mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}_k, \mathsf{L}_k)\} : a_j \in \mathfrak{Lip}_1(\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j)\}.$$

Then $\varrho(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) = \max\{\rho_1(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}), \rho_2(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})\}$.

Remark 2.36. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. Let γ be a bridge from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$. By Definition (2.31) and Definition (2.35), if $a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ with $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = 1$ then, there exists $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ such that $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b) \leqslant 1$ and $\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(a, b) \leqslant \varrho(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, since the Hausdorff distance between two compact sets is "reached" [2]. If $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ is not a scalar multiple of $1_{\mathfrak{A}}$, then one may find b' as above for $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)^{-1}a$, and check that if $b = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)b'$, we have:

$$\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \text{ and } \mathsf{bn}_{\gamma}(a, b) \leqslant \varrho(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a). \tag{2.1}$$

Inequation (2.1) is obviously valid for $a \in \mathbb{R}1_{\mathfrak{A}}$ as well with $b = \varphi(a)1_{\mathfrak{B}}$ for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$, and thus for all $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, there exists $b \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ such that Inequation (2.1) holds.

Our second core numerical value associated to a bridge is the essential component in estimating how useful a given bridge is to compute estimates on distances between states. Informally, given a bridge $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi, \rho)$ from some Leibniz quantum compact metric space to another, we wish to know how far ω is from the identity of $\mathfrak{D}$, in some sense. If $\omega = 1_{\mathfrak{D}}$, then the bridge norm for γ is given by the norm in $\mathfrak{D}$, and it becomes easy to compute estimates of the distance between states based on the bridge norm. In general, we would want ω to be close enough to $1_{\mathfrak{D}}$ to still give relevant estimates. On the other hand, asking $\|\omega - 1_{\mathfrak{D}}\|_{\mathfrak{D}}$ to be small is much too strong; it would in particular prevent the proofs in our second section of this paper from working. A much more appropriate choice is to use the quantum metric structures to introduce a weak form a measurement of the difference between ω and $1_{\mathfrak{D}}$ which fits our purpose. This second quantity associated to bridges is based on the 1-level introduced in Definition (2.25), which is never empty for a bridge.

Definition 2.37. Let $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. The *height* of a bridge $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$ for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ is the non negative real number $\varsigma\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)$ defined by:

$$\max\{\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}),\mathscr{S}(\pi_{\mathfrak{A}})(\mathscr{L}_1(\omega))),\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}),\mathscr{S}(\pi_{\mathfrak{B}})(\mathscr{L}_1(\omega))))\}.$$

To again clarify our notations somewhat, let $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, and let $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D},\omega,\pi_{\mathfrak{A}},\pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be a bridge from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$. Define:

$$\mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} = \left\{\varphi\circ\pi_{\mathfrak{A}} : \varphi\in\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D}) \text{ and } \left| \begin{array}{l}\varphi\left((1-\omega)^*(1-\omega)\right)=0\\ \varphi\left((1-\omega)(1-\omega)^*\right)=0\end{array}\right.\right\},$$

and define similarly $\mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. By Definition (2.28), the sets $\mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ are non-empty. Moreover, $\mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ are weak* compact. Let:

$$\varsigma_{\mathfrak{A}} = \mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}),\mathscr{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$$

and define $\varsigma_{\mathfrak{B}}$ similarly. Then $\varsigma\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)$ is the maximum of $\varsigma_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\varsigma_{\mathfrak{B}}$. We also note that if $\omega = 1_{\mathfrak{D}}$ then $\varsigma\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)=0$.

For our purpose, the proper notion of the length of a bridge is given by:

Definition 2.38. Let $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. The *length* of a bridge γ for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ is the non negative real number $\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)$ defined by:

$$\max\{\varrho\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right),\varsigma\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)\}.$$

We wish to use our notions of bridge reach and height to build a metric on Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. The natural idea is to consider, given two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, the infimum of the reach, the height or the length over all possible bridges from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$. All three ideas, however, do not quite give a satisfactory answer. The infimum of the reach would be zero in too many cases, as checked on very simple examples. The idea of the height of a bridge $(\mathfrak{D},\omega,\pi_{\mathfrak{A}},\pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ is precisely to ensure that, in some sense, ω is close to the unit of $\mathfrak{D}$ for the purpose of constructing a distance rather than a pseudo-distance. Without this, the reach is essentially meaningless in general. However, the height does not satisfy any triangle inequality. Indeed, if one is given three Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces $(\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathsf{L}_1)$, $(\mathfrak{A}_2,\mathsf{L}_2)$ and $(\mathfrak{A}_3,\mathsf{L}_3)$ and two bridges $(\mathfrak{D}_1,\omega_1,\pi_1,\rho_2)$ and $(\mathfrak{D}_2,\omega_2,\pi_2,\rho_2)$, respectively from $\mathfrak{A}_1$ to $\mathfrak{A}_2$ and from $\mathfrak{A}_2$ to $\mathfrak{A}_3$, then a natural mean to construct a bridge from $\mathfrak{A}_1$ to $\mathfrak{A}_3$ is to consider the amalgated free product $\mathfrak{E} = D_1 \star_{\mathfrak{A}_2} \mathfrak{D}_2$. If $\iota_j : \mathfrak{D}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ are the canonical *-monomorphisms, then the obvious candidate for an "amalgated bridge" is $(\mathfrak{E},\omega_1\omega_2,\iota_1\circ\pi_1,\iota_2\circ\rho_2)$. However, two problems arise. First, we have no reason to expect $\omega_1\omega_2\neq 0$, let alone $\|\omega_1\omega_2\|_{\mathfrak{E}}\geqslant 1$. Second of all, even under the best circumstances, the height of this amalgated bridge would most likely grow by an unpredictable amount, as it is very unclear how to relate the 1-level set of $\omega_1\omega_2$ with the 1-level sets of ω_1 and ω_2. This construction, though the natural path to attempt a proof of the triangle inequality for the natural ideas of metrics introduced at the start of this paragraph, would thus fail to provide the desired estimates. However, we shall still work with the same general idea, yet enforcing the triangle inequality in our very definition.

To address this problem, we introduce the notion of a (finite) paths between two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, build with bridges:

Notation 2.39. The set $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ of nonzero natural numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{N}_+$.

Definition 2.40. A *trek* from a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$ to a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$ is a n-tuple:

$$(\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j, \gamma_j, \mathfrak{A}_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n)$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, where $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1) = (\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$, $(\mathfrak{A}_{n+1}, \mathsf{L}_{n+1}) = (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$, and for all $j = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the pair $(\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j)$ is a Leibniz quantum compact metric space and γ_j is a bridge between $\mathfrak{A}_j$ and $\mathfrak{A}_{j+1}$.

Notation 2.41. The set of all treks from a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$ to a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$ is denoted by:

$$\mathscr{T}\!\mathit{reks}((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}) \to (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})).$$

We can thus define the length of a trek:

Definition 2.42. The length $\lambda\left(\Gamma\right)$ of a trek $\Gamma = (\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j, \gamma_j, \mathfrak{A}_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n)$ is the non-negative real number:

$$\lambda\left(\Gamma\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda\left(\gamma_j \middle| \mathsf{L}_j, \mathsf{L}_{j+1}\right).$$

We now define the core concept of this paper:

Definition 2.43. The *quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity* $\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}))$ between two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$ is the non-negative real number:

$$\inf\{\lambda\left(\Gamma\right) : \Gamma \in \mathscr{T}\!\mathit{reks}((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}) \to (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}))\}.$$

We shall often refers to the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity simply as the quantum propinquity.

Our Definition (2.43) is in fact quite flexible. It is possible to modify it to work within any chosen class of quantum compact metric spaces, as long as the Lip-norms involve behave well with respect to the multiplication. Here is a simple example of such a modification, which may prove useful in further applications. All along this section, we will remark that our work applies to these specialized propinquities just as well as our main quantum propinquity.

Definition 2.44. Let C be a class of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. The *C-specialized quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity* $\Lambda_C((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}))$ between two elements $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$ of C is the non-negative real number:

$$\inf\{\lambda\left(\Gamma\right) : \Gamma \in \mathscr{T}\!\mathit{reks}((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}) \to (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}))_C\},$$

where $\mathscr{T}\!\mathit{reks}((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}) \to (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}))_C$ is the subset of $\mathscr{T}\!\mathit{reks}((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}) \to (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}))$:

$$\begin{aligned}\{(\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j, \gamma_j, \mathfrak{A}_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n) \in \mathscr{T}\!\mathit{reks}((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}) \to (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})) :& \\ \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\} \quad (\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j) \in C\}.&\end{aligned}$$

Example 2.45. A natural choice of a class C in Definition (2.44) is the class of compact C*-metric spaces whose underlying space is a C*-algebra (rather than a C*-normed algebra) introduced by Rieffel in [36], which are Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces whose Lip-norms are the restrictions of densely defined, lower-semicontinuous strong Leibniz seminorms. We can thus work with Λ_{C^*} instead of Λ if one wishes to ensure all Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces involved are in fact compact C*-metric spaces.

Remark 2.46. We note that for any class C of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, the quantum C-propinquity dominates the quantum propinquity.

Our purpose is to prove that the quantum propinquity is a distance on classes of quantum isometric isomorphic Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. We first check that our quantum propinquity is always real-valued:

Proposition 2.47. *Let* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ *and* $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ *be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. Then:*

$$\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) \leqslant \max\{\mathrm{diam}\left(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}\right), \mathrm{diam}\left(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}\right)\}.$$

Proof. Let:

$$D = \max\{\mathrm{diam}\left(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}\right), \mathrm{diam}\left(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}\right)\}.$$

Let $\mathscr{H}$ be a separable, infinite Hilbert space. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ are separable, there exists faithful *-representation $\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and π_B of, respectively, $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ on $\mathscr{H}$. Let Ω be the C*-algebra of all bounded operators on $\mathscr{H}$ and let ω be the identity operator on $\mathscr{H}$. Let $\gamma = (\Omega, \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$. First, note that the 1-level set $\mathscr{L}_1(\omega)$ is $\mathscr{S}(\Omega)$, and thus is nonempty. By Definition (2.28), γ is a bridge from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$. Furthermore, since $\mathscr{S}(\pi_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $\mathscr{S}(\pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$ are both surjective, by Definition (2.37), we have $\varsigma\left(\gamma | \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) = 0$.

Let $\varphi_{\mathfrak{A}} \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$. For all $\psi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ and for all $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi(a - \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)1_{\mathfrak{A}})| = |\psi(a) - \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)| &\leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\psi, \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}) \\ &\leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\mathrm{diam}\left(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}}\right) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)D,\end{aligned}$$

hence $\|a - \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)1_{\mathfrak{A}}\|_{\mathfrak{A}} \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)D$.

Let $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ with $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \leqslant 1$. Let $b = \varphi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)1_{\mathfrak{B}}$. Then:

$$\|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\|_{\Omega} = \|a - \varphi(a)1_{\mathfrak{A}}\|_{\mathfrak{A}} \leqslant D.$$

Similarly, given any $\varphi_{\mathfrak{B}} \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$, we have $\|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(\varphi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)1_{\mathfrak{A}})\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\| \leqslant D$ for all $b \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ with $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b) \leqslant 1$. Hence $\varrho\left(\gamma | \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) \leqslant D$ by Definition (2.35).

Therefore, by Definition (2.38), we have:

$$\lambda\left(\gamma | \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) = \max\{\varrho\left(\gamma | \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right), \varsigma\left(\gamma | \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)\} \leqslant D.$$

Let $\Gamma = ((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \gamma, \mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}))$, which is a trek from $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ to $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ with the same length as the bridge γ for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$. Thus by Definitions (2.42) and (2.43), we have:

$$\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) \leqslant \lambda\left(\Gamma\right) \leqslant D,$$

as desired. $\square$

Now, we check that by construction, symmetry and the triangle inequality are satisfied:

Theorem 2.48. *Let* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ *and* $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{D}})$ *be three Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. We have:*

1. $\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) = \Lambda((\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}), (\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}))$,
2. $\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}), (\mathfrak{D}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{D}})) \leqslant \Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) + \Lambda((\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}), (\mathfrak{D}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{D}}))$.

Proof. As a matter of notations, if $(\mathfrak{E}, \omega, \pi, \rho)$ is a bridge from $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ to $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, then $\gamma^{-1} = (\mathfrak{E}, \omega, \rho, \pi)$ is a bridge from $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ to $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. Of course:

$$\lambda\left(\gamma^{-1}\middle|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}\right) = \lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right).$$

If $\Gamma = (A_j, \mathsf{L}_j, \gamma_j, \mathfrak{A}_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{j+1} : j = 0, \ldots, n\}$ is a trek from $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ to $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, then $\Gamma^{-1} = (A_{n+2-j}, \mathsf{L}_{n+2-j}, \gamma^{-1}_{n+1-j}, \mathfrak{A}_{n+1-j}, \mathsf{L}_{n+1-j} : j = 1, \ldots, n)$ is a trek from $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ to $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ by definition, and of course $\lambda\left(\Gamma\right) = \lambda\left(\Gamma^{-1}\right)$. This proves that our quantum propinquity is symmetric.

Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be treks, respectively, from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$ and from $\mathfrak{B}$ to $\mathfrak{D}$. We write:

$$\Gamma_1 = (A_j, \mathsf{L}_j, \gamma_j, \mathfrak{A}_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n_1) \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\Gamma_2 = (\mathfrak{B}_j, \mathsf{L}'_j, \delta_j, \mathfrak{B}_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}'_{j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n_2). \tag{2.3}$$

We have $(\mathfrak{A}_{n_1+1}, \mathsf{L}_{n_1+1}) = (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) = (\mathfrak{B}_1, \mathsf{L}'_1)$ by definition of treks. Thus, if we define for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_1 + n_2\}$:

$$(\mathfrak{E}_j, \mathsf{L}''_j) = \begin{cases} (\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j) \text{ if } j = 1, \ldots, n_1, \\ (\mathfrak{B}_{j-n_1}, \mathsf{L}'_{j-n_1}) \text{ if } j = n_1 + 1, \ldots, n_2 + n_1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\kappa_j = \begin{cases} \gamma_j \text{ if } j = 1, \ldots, n_1, \\ \delta_{j-n_1} \text{ if } j = n_1 + 1, \ldots, n_2 + n_1, \end{cases}$$

and if we write:

$$\Gamma_1 \star \Gamma_2 = (\mathfrak{E}_j, \mathsf{L}''_j, \kappa_j, D_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n_1 + n_2)$$

then $\Gamma_1 \star \Gamma_2$ is a trek from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{D}$. Moreover, by construction, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\left(\Gamma_1 \star \Gamma_2\right) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_1+n_2} \lambda\left(\kappa_j \middle| \mathsf{L}''_j, \mathsf{L}''_{j+1}\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \lambda\left(\gamma_j \middle| \mathsf{L}_j, \mathsf{L}_{j+1}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \lambda\left(\delta_j \middle| \mathsf{L}'_j, \mathsf{L}'_{j+1}\right) \\ &= \lambda\left(\Gamma_1\right) + \lambda\left(\Gamma_2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Now, let $\varepsilon > 0$. By definition of the quantum propinquity, there exists a trek Γ_1 from $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and a trek from Γ_2 from $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ to $(\mathfrak{D}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{D}})$ such that:

$$\lambda\left(\Gamma_1\right) \leqslant \Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon,$$

and

$$\lambda\left(\Gamma_2\right) \leqslant \Lambda((\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}),(\mathfrak{D},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{D}})) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon.$$

By Equation (2.4), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{D},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{D}})) &\leqslant \lambda\left(\Gamma_1 \star \Gamma_2\right)\\ &= \lambda\left(\Gamma_1\right) + \lambda\left(\Gamma_2\right)\\ &\leqslant \Lambda((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) + \Lambda((\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}),(\mathfrak{D},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) + \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that the quantum propinquity Λ satisfies the triangle inequality. $\square$

Remark 2.49. For any class C of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, the C-specialized quantum propinquity also satisfies the triangle inequality and is symmetric, as can be checked using the proof of Theorem (2.48), where we simply replace the sets $\mathscr{Treks}((\cdot) \to (\cdot))$ with the sets $\mathscr{Treks}((\cdot) \to (\cdot))_C$.

The idea to enforce the triangle inequality by taking our metric to be an infimum over all possible paths is a standard technique, but it has a price: we must put all our efforts in the proof that distance zero is equivalent to quantum isometric isomorphism. To this end, we first introduce a natural notion.

Definition 2.50. An *itinerary* for a trek $\Gamma = (\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathsf{L}_j, \gamma_j, \mathfrak{A}_{j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n)$ from a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ to a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ is a $(n+1)$-tuple $\eta = (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_{n+1})$ with $\eta_j \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_j)$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\}$. The itinerary η *starts* at η_1 and *ends* at η_{n+1}, or equivalent is an itinerary *from* η_1 *to* η_{n+1}.

Notation 2.51. Let Γ be a trek from a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ to a Leibniz quantum compact metric space $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ and let $a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$. The set of all itineraries from a to b is denoted by $\mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma} b\right)$. The set of all itineraries starting at a is denoted by $\mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma} \cdot\right)$ while the set of all itineraries ending at b is denoted by $\mathscr{Itineraries}\left(\cdot \xrightarrow{\Gamma} b\right)$.

The fundamental property of our quantum propinquity is that it satisfies the following strong axiom of coincidence on the quantum isometry classes of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces.

Theorem 2.52. *Let $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. If*

$$\Lambda((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) = 0,$$

*then there exists a *-isomorphism $h : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}} \circ h = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$.*

Proof. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, by Definition (2.43), there exists a trek Γ_ε from $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ to $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ such that:

$$\lambda\left(\Gamma_\varepsilon\right) \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

For each $\varepsilon > 0$, we fix, once and for all, such a trek Γ_ε. We shall need a bit of notations moving forward. First, we write:

$$\Gamma_\varepsilon = (\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}, \gamma_{\varepsilon,j}, \mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1} : j = 1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon).$$

By Definition (2.40), $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}) = (\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,1}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,1})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) = (\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,n_\varepsilon+1}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,n_\varepsilon+1})$. Moreover, for all $j = 1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon$, we are given a bridge $\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}$ from $\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}$ to $\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1}$. For all $j = 1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon$, we write $\gamma_{\varepsilon,j} = (\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}, \omega_{\varepsilon,j}, \pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}, \pi^r_{\varepsilon,j})$, where, by Definition (2.28), $\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}$ is a unital *-algebra, $\omega_{\varepsilon,j} \in \mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}$ has nonempty 1-level, while $\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j} : \mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}$ and $\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j} : \mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}$ are unital *-monomorphisms.

By Definition (2.42) of the length of a trek, we have:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_\varepsilon} \lambda\left(\gamma_{\varepsilon,j} \middle| \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}\right) \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

To lighten notations, we set:

$$\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} = \max\left\{\lambda\left(\gamma_{\varepsilon,j} \middle| \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}\right), \frac{\varepsilon}{2n_\varepsilon}\right\} > 0.$$

Note that, by Definition (2.38), for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon\}$:

$$\begin{cases} \varrho\left(\gamma_{\varepsilon,j} \middle| \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}\right) \leqslant \lambda_{\varepsilon,j}, \\ \varsigma\left(\gamma_{\varepsilon,j} \middle| \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}\right) \leqslant \lambda_{\varepsilon,j}, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n_\varepsilon} \lambda_{\varepsilon,j} \leqslant \varepsilon. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

We start the first phase of our proof, where we construct and analyze the sets of endpoints of itineraries with a fixed starting point and a bounded bridge length at every step.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$.

Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon\}$. Let $a_j \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j})$ and $r > \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}(a_j)$. Since

$$\varrho\left(\gamma_{\varepsilon,j} \middle| \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}, \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}\right) \leqslant \lambda_{\varepsilon,j} \text{ and } \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}(r^{-1}a_j) \leqslant 1,$$

there exists $a_{j+1} \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1})$ with $\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}(a_{j+1}) \leqslant r$ and:

$$\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}}\left(a_j, a_{j+1}\right) = \|\pi^l_{j,\varepsilon}(a_j)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(a_{j+1})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} \leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j},$$

by Remark (2.36). Thus, by induction, given $a_1 \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, there exists an itinerary $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n_\varepsilon+1})$ for Γ_ε such that, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon + 1\}$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}(a_{j+1}) \leqslant r, \\ \mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}}\left(a_j, a_{j+1}\right) \leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, for all $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$, the set $\mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)$ defined as:

$$\left\{\eta \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot\right) \middle| \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon\} \quad \begin{matrix} \mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}}\left(\eta_j, \eta_{j+1}\right) \leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j}, \\ \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}(\eta_{j+1}) \leqslant r, \end{matrix}\right\} \tag{2.6}$$

is not empty. We shall also denote the (possibly empty) subset of $\mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)$ of itineraries which ends up at $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ by $\mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \middle| r\right)$. It is trivial to check that:

$$\emptyset \neq \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right) = \bigcup_{b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})} \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \middle| r\right)$$

and thus, for all $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$, there exists at least one $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ such $\mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \middle| r\right)$ is not empty.

Fix $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. Let $\eta \in \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)$. Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon\}$. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1})$. By Definition (2.37) of the height of the bridge $\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}$, there exists $\psi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j})$ such that $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}}(\varphi, \psi \circ \pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}) \leqslant \lambda_{\varepsilon,j}$ and $\psi(d\omega_{\varepsilon,j}) = \psi(\omega_{\varepsilon,j} d) = \psi(d)$ for all $d \in \mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\varphi(\eta_{j+1})| &\leqslant |\varphi(\eta_{j+1}) - \psi \circ \pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_{j+1})| + |\psi \circ \pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_{j+1})| \\
&\leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + |\psi \circ \pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_{j+1}) - \psi \circ \pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_j)| + |\psi \circ \pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_j)| \\
&\leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + |\psi(\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_{j+1})\omega_{\varepsilon,j}) - \psi(\omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_j))| + \|\eta_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} \\
&\leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + \|\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_j)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j+1}(\eta_{j+1})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} + \|\eta_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} \\
&\leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + \|a_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} \\
&\leqslant 2r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + \|\eta_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We thus conclude that, since $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1})$ was arbitrary, we have for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon\}$:

$$\|\eta_{j+1}\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1}} \leqslant \|\eta_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} + 2r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j}.$$

Hence, by induction, for all $j \in \{2, \ldots, n_\varepsilon + 1\}$, we get:

$$\|\eta_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} \leqslant \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + (2r)\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \lambda_{\varepsilon,j},$$

and thus:

$$\|\eta_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} \leqslant \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 2r\varepsilon. \tag{2.7}$$

Let us now define for all $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ the set:

$$\mathfrak{P}(a, \varepsilon, r) = \left\{ b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B}) : \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \middle| r\right) \neq \emptyset \right\}$$

and note that $\mathfrak{P}(a, \varepsilon, r) \neq \emptyset$ as long as $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$, as we observed when defining $\mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)$ by Equation (2.6). Moreover, by Equation (2.7), we note that if $b \in \mathfrak{P}(a, \varepsilon, r)$ then:

$$\|b\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leqslant \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 2r\varepsilon. \tag{2.8}$$

Let $a, a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and,for some $r > \max\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a')\}$, let $b \in \mathfrak{P}(a, \varepsilon, r)$ and $b' \in \mathfrak{P}(a', \varepsilon, r)$. Let $\eta \in \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \middle| r\right)$ and $\eta' \in \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a' \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b' \middle| r\right)$. For all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon + 1\}$, using Inequation (2.7), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_j\eta'_j)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_{j+1}\eta'_{j+1})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} &\\
&\leqslant \|\eta_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} \|\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta'_j)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta'_{j+1})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} \\
&\quad + \|\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_j)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_{j+1})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} \|\eta'_{j+1}\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1}} \\
&\leqslant \left(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 2r\varepsilon\right) r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + \left(\|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 2r\varepsilon\right) r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} \\
&= r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j}\left(4r\varepsilon + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

The same computation would show:

$$\|\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta'_j\eta_j)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{j,\varepsilon}(\eta'_{j+1}\eta_{j+1})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} \leqslant \lambda_{\varepsilon,j} r\left(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 4r\varepsilon\right).$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_{j,\varepsilon}}\left(\eta_j \circledcirc \eta'_j, \eta_{j+1} \circledcirc \eta'_{j+1}\right) &= \left\|\pi^l_{j,\varepsilon}\left(\eta_j \circledcirc \eta'_j\right)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{j,\varepsilon}\left(\eta_{j+1} \circledcirc \eta'_{j+1}\right)\right\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} \\
&\leqslant \lambda_{\varepsilon,j} r\left(4r\varepsilon + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}$ is a Leibniz Lip-norm for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon\}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}\left(\eta_{j+1} \circledcirc \eta'_{j+1}\right) &\leqslant \|\eta_{j+1}\|_{\varepsilon,j+1}\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}(\eta'_{j+1}) + \|\eta'_{j+1}\|_{\varepsilon,j+1}\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}(\eta_{j+1}) \\
&\leqslant \left(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 2r\varepsilon\right) r + \left(\|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 2r\varepsilon\right) r \\
&= r\left(4r\varepsilon + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We thus have proven:

$$(\eta_j \circledcirc \eta'_j : j = 1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon + 1) \in \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \circledcirc a' \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \circledcirc b' \middle| r\left(4r\varepsilon + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\right)\right),$$

and thus by definition:

$$b \circledcirc b' \in \mathfrak{P}\left(a \circledcirc a', \varepsilon, r\left(4r\varepsilon + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\right)\right). \tag{2.9}$$

A similar computation would prove that:

$$\left[b, b'\right]_* \in \mathfrak{P}\left(\left[a, a'\right]_*, \varepsilon, r\left(4r\varepsilon + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\right)\right). \tag{2.10}$$

Our next step is to bound the diameters in norm of the $\mathfrak{P}$ sets introduced above.

Let $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$, and for $j = 0, \ldots, n_\varepsilon$, define the set $\mathfrak{p}_j(a, \varepsilon, r)$ by:

$$\mathfrak{p}_j(a, \varepsilon, r) = \left\{\eta_{j+1} \in \mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1} : \eta \in \mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)\right\}.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{p}_n(a, \varepsilon, r) = \mathfrak{P}(a, \varepsilon, r)$ and $\mathfrak{p}_0(a, \varepsilon, r) = \{a\}$. In particular, $\mathfrak{p}_0(a, \varepsilon, r)$ has diameter 0.

Let $a, a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $r > \max\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a')\}$. Let $j = 1, \ldots, n_\varepsilon$, Let $b \in \mathfrak{p}_j(a, \varepsilon, r)$ and $b' \in \mathfrak{p}_j(a', \varepsilon, r)$, and let $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1})$. By Definition (2.37) of the height of the bridge $\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}$, there exists $\psi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j})$ such that $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j+1}}(\varphi, \psi \circ \pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}) \leqslant \lambda_{\varepsilon,j}$, and $\psi(\omega_{\varepsilon,j}d) = \psi(d\omega_{\varepsilon,j}) = \psi(d)$ for all $d \in \mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}$. Moreover, by definition of $\mathscr{I}\mathit{tineraries}\left(\cdot \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)$, there exists $c \in \mathfrak{p}_{j-1}(a, \varepsilon, r)$ and $c' \in \mathfrak{p}_{j-1}(a', \varepsilon, r)$ such that:

$$\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}}(c, b) \leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}}(c', b') \leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j}.$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}|\varphi(b-b')| &= \left|\varphi(b-b') - \psi\circ\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(b-b')\right| + \left|\psi\left(\omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(b-b')\right)\right| \\ &\leqslant 2r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + |\psi(\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(c')\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(b')) - \psi\circ\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(c') \\ &\quad + \psi\circ\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(c) - \psi(\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(c)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(b))| \\ &\leqslant 2r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + \|\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(c')\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(b')\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} \\ &\quad + \|\pi^l_{\varepsilon,j}(c)\omega_{\varepsilon,j} - \omega_{\varepsilon,j}\pi^r_{\varepsilon,j}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon,j}} + \|c-c'\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}} \\ &\leqslant 4r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + \|c-c'\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}}.\end{aligned}$$

We have thus shown, as $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1})$ was arbitrary, that for all $\eta \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)$ and $\eta' \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a' \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} \cdot \middle| r\right)$, and for all $j \in \{1,\ldots,n_\varepsilon+1\}$:

$$\|\eta_{j+1} - \eta'_{j+1}\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1}} \leqslant 4r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j} + \|\eta_j - \eta'_j\|_{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

Thus, in particular, if $a = a'$, we have:

$$\operatorname{diam}\left(\mathfrak{p}_j(a,\varepsilon,r), \|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j+1}}\right) \leqslant \operatorname{diam}\left(\mathfrak{p}_{j-1}(a,\varepsilon,r), \|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{\varepsilon,j}}\right) + 4r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j}.$$

By induction, we conclude:

$$\operatorname{diam}\left(\mathfrak{P}(a,\varepsilon,r), \|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) \leqslant 4r\varepsilon. \tag{2.11}$$

More generally, we obtain by an easy induction:

$$\sup\{\|b-b'\|_{\mathfrak{B}} : b \in \mathfrak{P}(a,\varepsilon,r), b' \in \mathfrak{P}(a',\varepsilon,r))\} \leqslant \|a-a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 4r\varepsilon. \tag{2.12}$$

*We are now in a position to construct, in the second phase of this proof, a unital *-morphism $h : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathfrak{B}$ which is also a quantum isometry.* We do not need to work with a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ any longer.

Fix first $a \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, and let $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$. Choose any strictly increasing function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}_+$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. By Equation (2.8), the set $\mathfrak{P}(a,\varepsilon,r)$ is a subset of the set:

$$\mathfrak{c}(r,a) = \{b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B}) : \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b) \leqslant r \text{ and } \|b\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leqslant 2r + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\}.$$

By [32], as $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is a closed Lip-norm, the set $\mathfrak{c}(r,a)$ is compact for the norm topology of $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$. Hence, the norm closure $\mathfrak{C}(a,\varepsilon,r)$ of $\mathfrak{P}(a,\varepsilon,r)$ is itself a norm compact subset of $\mathfrak{c}(r,a)$. The metric space consisting of the compact subsets of $\mathfrak{c}(r,a)$ endowed with the Hausdorff distance induced by the norm of $\mathfrak{B}$ is itself compact since $\mathfrak{c}(r,a)$ is compact. Thus, there exists a strictly increasing function $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\left(\mathfrak{C}(a,(f\circ g)(m)^{-1},r)\right)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges for $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$ to some compact subset $\mathfrak{P}_{f\circ g}(a,r)$ of $\mathfrak{c}(r,a)$.

Let $\mathfrak{a} = \{a_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a countable, dense subset of $\operatorname{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. To ease notations, let $l(a) = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) + 1$ for all $a \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. Using the observation of the previous paragraph, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $g_k : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}_+$ strictly increasing, such that $(\mathfrak{P}(a_k, g_k(m)^{-1}, l(a_k)))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to some set $\mathfrak{P}_{g_k}(a_k, l(a_k))$ in $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$. One then easily checks that, setting:

$$f : n \in \mathbb{N} \longmapsto g_0 \circ g_1 \circ \ldots g_n(n),$$

the sequence $(\mathfrak{P}(a_k, f(m)^{-1}, l(a_k)))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$ to $\mathfrak{P}_{g_k}(a_k, l(a_k))$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. With our notations, we have $\mathfrak{P}_{g_k}(a_k, l(a_k)) = \mathfrak{P}_f(a_k, l(a_k))$, and thus, since f does not depend on $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we simply denote $\mathfrak{P}_{g_k}(a_k, l(a_k))$ by $\mathfrak{P}(a_k, l(a_k))$ for for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

By Equation (2.11), we conclude that for all $a \in \mathfrak{a}$:

$$\operatorname{diam}(\mathfrak{P}(a, l(a)), \|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}) = 0. \tag{2.13}$$

We fix $a \in \mathfrak{a}$. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, l(a))$ be chosen arbitrarily. Then Equation (2.11) proves that $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ for the norm of $\mathfrak{B}$. Indeed, let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by Equation (2.13), there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $q \geqslant M$, we have:

$$\operatorname{diam}\left(\mathfrak{P}(a, f(q)^{-1}, l(a)), \|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon. \tag{2.14}$$

There also exists $M' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $p, q \geqslant M'$, we have:

$$\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}(\mathfrak{P}(a, f(p)^{-1}, l(a)), \mathfrak{P}(a, f(q)^{-1}, l(a))) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon, \tag{2.15}$$

as $(\mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, l(a))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges, and hence is Cauchy, for $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$.

Let $p, q \geqslant \max\{M, M'\}$. By Inequation (2.15), then there exists:

$$c_q \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f(q)^{-1}, l(a))$$

such that $\|c_q - b_p\|_{\mathfrak{B}} < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$. By Inequation (2.14), we also have $\|b_q - c_q\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$. Hence $\|b_p - b_q\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leqslant \varepsilon$. Thus $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is indeed Cauchy in $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$. Since $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ is complete, the sequence $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges. Let us temporarily denote its limit by b.

It is easy to check that $b \in \mathfrak{P}(a, l(a))$: for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \geqslant M$, the diameter of $\mathfrak{P}(a_k, f(m)^{-1}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) + 1)$ is less than $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$, and there exists $M' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \geqslant M'$, we have $\|b_m - b\|_{\mathfrak{B}} < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$, so for all $m \geqslant \max\{M, M'\}$, the set $\mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, l(a))$ lies within the open ε-neighborhood of b for $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}$. So $\{b\} \in \mathfrak{P}(a, l(a))$ by definition.

Thus, to summarize our two last paragraphs: $\mathfrak{P}(a, l(a))$ is not empty, and it is reduced to a single point in $\mathfrak{B}$ by Equation (2.13). We define $h(a)$, for all $a \in \mathfrak{a}$, by:

$$\{h(a)\} = \mathfrak{P}(a, l(a)). \tag{2.16}$$

We thus have shown that for all sequences $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ and $a \in \mathfrak{a}$:

$$\left(\forall m \in \mathbb{N} \quad b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, l(a))\right) \implies \lim_{m\to\infty} b_m = h(a). \tag{2.17}$$

Now, let $r \geqslant l(a) = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) + 1$ for some $a \in \mathfrak{a}$ and $q : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a strictly increasing function. As we discussed at the beginning of this second part of our proof (right after Equation (2.12)), there exists a strictly increasing function $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\mathfrak{P}(a, (f \circ q \circ g)(m)^{-1}, r))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to some set $\mathfrak{P}_{f\circ q\circ g}(a, r)$ in $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$. As above, using (In)Equations (2.13) and (2.11), one would show that $\mathfrak{P}_{f\circ q\circ g}(a, r)$ is a singleton, and any sequence $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, (f \circ q \circ$

$g)(m)^{-1}, r)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ converges to the element of this singleton. On the other hand, by construction, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\emptyset \neq \mathfrak{P}(a, f \circ q \circ g(m)^{-1}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) + 1) \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(a, f \circ q \circ g(m)^{-1}, r)$$

so, in particular, $\mathfrak{P}(a, f \circ q \circ g(m)^{-1}, r)$ contains a sequence $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f \circ q \circ g(m)^{-1}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) + 1)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By Equation (2.17), the limit of $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is both the single element of $\mathfrak{P}_{f\circ q\circ g}(a, r)$ and $h(a)$. By uniqueness of the limit, we conclude that $\mathfrak{P}_{f\circ q\circ g}(a, r) = \{h(a)\}$.

Thus, as q was an arbitrary strictly increasing function, we conclude that every sub-sequence of $(\mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ admits a sub-sequence converging to the set $\{h(a)\}$ in $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$. Thus, $(\mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges itself to $\{h(a)\}$ for the metric $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$.

It is trivial that $(\mathfrak{P}(a, f^{-1}(m), r))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\{h(a)\}$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{a}$ and $r \in (\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) + 1]$ using Equation (2.17). Thus we have shown:

$$\forall a \in \mathfrak{a} \quad \forall r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \qquad \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r)) = \{h(a)\}, \tag{2.18}$$

where the limit is taken in the topology induced on compact subsets of $\mathfrak{B}$ by $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$.

We now extend the map h to $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. Let $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ be chosen. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $a' \in \mathfrak{a}$ with $\|a - a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$. Let $r > \max\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a')\}$. Using Equation (2.18), let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $m \geqslant M$, we have:

$$\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}(\mathfrak{P}(a', f(m)^{-1}, r), \{h(a')\}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Let $M' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \geqslant M'$, we have $f(m)^{-1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{12r}$. Let $m \geqslant \max\{M, M'\}$. By Inequation (2.12), for all $b \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r)$ and $b' \in \mathfrak{P}(a', f(m)^{-1}, r)$, we have $\|b - b'\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leqslant \|a - a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 4rf(m)^{-1} \leqslant \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}$. Thus, for $m \geqslant \max\{M, M'\}$, $\mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r)$ is a subset of the $\frac{2\varepsilon}{3}$-neighborhood of $\mathfrak{P}(a', f^{-1}(m), r)$. Hence, $\mathfrak{P}(a, f^{-1}(m), r)$ lies within the closed ball of center $h(a')$ and radius ε. By the triangular inequality, we deduce that the sequence $(\mathfrak{P}(a, f^{-1}(m), r))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy for the Hausdorff distance $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$ on compact subsets of $\mathfrak{c}(a, r)$, which is complete, since $\mathfrak{c}(a, r)$ is compact. Hence, $(\mathfrak{P}(a, f^{-1}(m), r))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges as well for $\mathsf{h}_{\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}$ to some set $\mathfrak{P}(a, r)$. By the same reasoning as before using (In)Equations (2.13) and (2.12), the $\mathfrak{P}(a, r)$ is a singleton consisting of the limit of any sequence $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ chosen so that $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f^{-1}(m), r)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$. We denote this singleton by $\{h(a)\}$.

We thus have defined a map $h : \mathfrak{a} \to \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$. *We now enter the third and last phase of our construction of h, when we use our understanding of the $\mathfrak{P}$ sets to study h.*

As a first step, we prove that h is linear on the $\mathbb{R}$-vector space $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. Let $a, a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $r > \max\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a')\}$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We choose:

$$\eta^m \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_{f(m)^{-1}}} \cdot \middle| r\right) \text{ and } \xi^m \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a' \xrightarrow{\Gamma_{f(m)^{-1}}} \cdot \middle| r\right).$$

Let $b = \eta^m_{n_{f(m)^{-1}}+1}$ and $b' = \xi^m_{n_{f(m)^{-1}+1}}$ be the endpoints of, respectively, η^m and ξ^m. By construction, $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r)$ and $b'_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a', f(m)^{-1}, r)$. Moreover, for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, n_{f(m)^{-1}}\}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\pi^l_{f(m)^{-1},j}(\eta^m_j + t\xi^m_j)\omega_{f(m)^{-1},j} - \omega_{f(m)^{-1},j}\pi^l_{f(m)^{-1},j}(\eta^m_j + t\xi^m_j)\|_{\mathfrak{D}_{f(m)^{-1},j}} \\ \leqslant (1+|t|)r\lambda_{f(m)^{-1},j}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathsf{L}_{f(m)^{-1},j+1}(\eta^m_{j+1} + t\xi^m_{j+1}) \leqslant r(1+|t|).$$

Hence:

$$(\eta^m_j + t\xi^m_j : j = 1, \ldots, n_{f(m)^{1-}} + 1) \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a + ta' \overset{\Gamma_{f(m)^{-1}}}{\longrightarrow} \cdot \middle| (1+|t|)r\right).$$

Hence $b_m + tb'_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a + ta', f(m)^{-1}, (1+|t|)r)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since:

$$\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a + ta') \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) + |t|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a') < (1+|t|)r$$

by construction, we conclude from Equation (2.18) that:

$$h(a + ta') = \lim_{m\to\infty}(b_m + tb'_m) = \lim_{m\to\infty} b_m + t\lim_{m\to\infty} b'_m = h(a) + th(a'),$$

as desired. *Hence, h is linear on* $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$.

Now, let $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and let $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r)$ for some $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$. by Equation (2.6), and since $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is lower-semi-continuous by assumption, we have:

$$\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(h(a)) \leqslant \liminf_{m\to\infty} \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b_m) \leqslant r.$$

As $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)$ is arbitrary, we conclude:

$$\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(h(a)) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a). \tag{2.19}$$

Moreover, by Inequation (2.8), we have:

$$\|h(a)\|_{\mathfrak{B}} = \lim_{m\to\infty}\|b_m\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \leqslant \lim_{m\to\infty}\left(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 2rf(m)^{-1}\right) = \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}. \tag{2.20}$$

Hence, h is a uniformly continuous linear map from $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, and thus it extends uniquely to a continuous linear map from $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ to $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$, which we still denote by h. We note that the norm of h is, at most, one.

We now check that h is a morphism for both the Jordan and Lie products from $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ to $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$.

Let $a, a' \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $r > \max\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a')\}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and choose $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, f(m)^{-1}, r)$ and $b'_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a', f(m)^{-1}, r)$. By Equation (2.9), we have $b_m \circledcirc b'_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a \circledcirc a', f(m)^{-1}, r')$ where $r' = r\left(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + 4rf(m)^{-1}\right)$. Since $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is Leibniz:

$$\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}\left(a \circledcirc a'\right) \leqslant \|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a') + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \leqslant r(\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} + \|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}) < r'.$$

Thus, we conclude by Equation (2.18) that:

$$h(a \circledcirc a') = \lim_{m\to\infty} b_m \circledcirc b'_m = \lim_{m\to\infty} b_m \circledcirc \lim_{m\to\infty} b'_m = h(a) \circledcirc h(a').$$

Similarly, we would prove that $[h(a), h(a')]_* = h([a, a']_*)$.

From the construction of h, since $1_{\mathfrak{B}} \in \mathfrak{P}(1_{\mathfrak{A}}, \varepsilon, r)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $r > 0$, we conclude easily that $h(1_{\mathfrak{A}}) = 1_{\mathfrak{B}}$. Since h has norm at most 1 by Inequation (2.20), we conclude that h has norm one.

Thus $h : \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ is a morphism for $\cdot \circledcirc \cdot$ and $[\cdot,\cdot]_*$ as well as a linear map of norm 1, such that $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}} \circ h \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$.

The rest of our work on h consists in extending it to $\mathfrak{A}$ in the natural manner. Let $\Re : z \in \mathbb{C} \mapsto \frac{z+\overline{z}}{2}$ and $\Im : z \in \mathbb{C} \mapsto \frac{z-\overline{z}}{2i}$ be, respectively, the real and imaginary part on $\mathbb{C}$. Let $a \in \mathfrak{A}$. We set:

$$h(a) = h(\Re(a)) + ih(\Im(a)),$$

and we trivially check that this definition of h is consistent on $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$. Moreover, it is straightforward that h thus extended is a continuous linear map on $\mathfrak{A}$, with values in $\mathfrak{B}$. Moreover, by construction, $h(a^*) = h(a)^*$. So h is a self-adjoint continuous linear map on $\mathfrak{A}$.

Let $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}$ be given. Using the fact that h, restricted to $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, is a morphism for the Jordan product, and h is linear on $\mathfrak{A}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} h(a \circledcirc b) &= h(\Re(a) \circledcirc Re(b)) + ih(\Re(a) \circledcirc \Im(b)) \\ &\quad + ih(\Im(a) \circledcirc \Re(b)) - h(\Im(a) \circledcirc \Im(b)) \\ &= h(\Re(a)) \circledcirc h(\Re(b)) + ih(\Re(a)) \circledcirc h(\Im(b)) \\ &\quad + ih(\Im(a)) \circledcirc h(\Re(b)) - h(\Im(a)) \circledcirc h(\Im(b)) \\ &= h(a) \circledcirc h(b). \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Again, the computation carries similarly to the Lie product.

To conclude, for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}$, by Equation (2.21) and its equivalent for the Lie product, as well as by linearity of h:

$$h(ab) = h(a \circledcirc b) + ih([a,b]_*) = h(a) \circledcirc h(b) + i[h(a), h(b)]_* = h(a)h(b).$$

*We have thus proven that h is a unital *-morphism from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\mathfrak{B}$ with $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}} \circ h \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ on* $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. This completes our construction of h.

*It remains to show that h is a *-isomorphism.* This last step of our proof consists in constructing the inverse of h using the same technique as used for the construction of h itself. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$.

For any $b \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ and $r > \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)$, let $\mathscr{Itineraries}\left(\cdot \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \middle| r\right)$ be the set:

$$\left\{ \eta \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(\cdot \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b\right) \middle| \forall j \in \{1.\ldots, n_\varepsilon\} \quad \begin{array}{l} \mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_{\varepsilon,j}}(\eta_j, \eta_{j+1}) \leqslant r\lambda_{\varepsilon,j}, \\ \mathsf{L}_{\varepsilon,j}(\eta_j) \leqslant r, \end{array} \right\}$$

and let $\mathfrak{Q}(b, \varepsilon, r)$ be the set:

$$\mathfrak{Q}(b, \varepsilon, r) = \left\{ a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\varepsilon} b \middle| r\right) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

By symmetry in the roles of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, we see that our $\mathfrak{Q}$ sets are the exact analogues of our $\mathfrak{P}$ sets, and as such they enjoy the same properties. We record two among them. First, note that for all $b, b' \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, we have:

$$\sup\{ \|a - a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}} : a \in \mathfrak{Q}(b, \varepsilon, r), a' \in \mathfrak{Q}(b', \varepsilon, r) \} \leqslant \|b - b'\| + 4r\varepsilon. \tag{2.22}$$

by applying Inequation (2.12). Moreover, using the conclusion of the last three sections of our proof, there exists a unital *-morphism $s : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ and there exists a strictly increasing function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_+$ such that for all $b \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$ and for all sequence $(a_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $a_m \in \mathfrak{P}(b, f\circ g(m)^{-1}, r)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\lim_{m\rightarrow\infty} a_m = s(a)$. Moreover, $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A} \circ s \leqslant \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$.

We claim that s is the inverse of h. To do so, let $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$ and $r > \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}(a)$. Let $(b_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})^\mathbb{N}$ with $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, (f\circ g)(m)^{-1}, r)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and note that $\lim_{m\rightarrow\infty} b_m = h(a)$. Similarly, let $(a_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})^\mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $a_m \in \mathfrak{Q}(h(a), (f\circ g)(m)^{-1}, r)$ (note that $r > \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}(a) \geqslant \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}(h(a))$). Again, we have $\lim_{m\rightarrow\infty} a_m = s(h(a))$. The key observation here is that by definition, since $b_m \in \mathfrak{P}(a, (f\circ g)(m)^{-1}, r)$, the set $\mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \overset{\Gamma_{f\circ g(m)^{-1}}}{\longrightarrow} b_m \middle| r\right)$ is not empty, so $a \in \mathfrak{Q}(b_m, (f\circ g)(m)^{-1}, r)$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \geqslant M$, we have $\|b_m - h(a)\|_\mathfrak{B} \leqslant \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon$. Let $M' \in \mathbb{N}$ be chosen so that for all $m \geqslant M'$ we have $\|a_m - s(h(a))\|_\mathfrak{A} < \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon$. Let $M'' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(f\circ g)^{-1}(m) < \frac{\varepsilon}{12r}$ for all $m \geqslant M''$. Let $m \geqslant \max\{M, M'\}$. By Inequation (2.22), since $a \in \mathfrak{Q}(b_m, (f\circ g)(m)^{-1}, r)$ and $a_m \in \mathfrak{Q}(h(a), (f\circ g)(m)^{-1}, r)$, we have:

$$\|a - a_m\|_\mathfrak{A} \leqslant 4r\varepsilon + \|b - b_m\|_\mathfrak{B} \leqslant \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon.$$

Hence:

$$\|a - s(h(a))\|_\mathfrak{A} \leqslant \|a - a_m\|_\mathfrak{A} + \|a_m - s(h(a))\|_\mathfrak{A} \leqslant \varepsilon.$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $a = s(h(a))$ for all $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$. Now, since $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$ is total in $\mathfrak{A}$ and h, s are *-morphisms, we conclude that:

$$\forall a \in \mathfrak{A} \quad a = s(h(a)).$$

Similarly, we would prove that for all $b \in \mathfrak{B}$, we have $b = h(s(b))$. Thus *h is a *-isomorphism from A onto $\mathfrak{B}$*. In particular, we conclude:

(1) For all $a \in \mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$, we have $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}(a) \geqslant \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}(h(a)) \geqslant \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}(s(h(a))) = \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}(a)$, so $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B} \circ h = \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$.
(2) Similarly, $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A} \circ s = \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}$ and $s : \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ is a *-isomorphism.

This concludes the proof of our main theorem. □

Remark 2.53. For any class C of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, the C-specialized quantum propinquity dominates the quantum propinquity, and thus Theorem (2.52) applies to Λ_C as well.

We are now able to state:

Theorem 2.54. *The quantum Gromov-Hausdorff Propinquity Λ is a metric on the quantum isometric isomorphic classes of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, in the following sense. For any three Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1)$, $(\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)$ and $(\mathfrak{A}_3, \mathsf{L}_3)$, we have:*

(1) $\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1), (\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)) \in [0, \infty)$,
(2) $\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1), (\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)) = \Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2), (\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1))$,
(3) $\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1), (\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)) \leqslant \Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1), (\mathfrak{A}_3, \mathsf{L}_3)) + \Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_3, \mathsf{L}_3), (\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2))$,

(4) $\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1), (\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)) = 0$ *if and only if there exists a quantum isometric isomorphism* $\varphi : (\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1) \to (\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)$.

Proof. Property (1) is a consequence of Proposition (2.47). Property (2) and Property (3) are proven in Theorem (2.48). Property (4) is necessary, as shown in our main Theorem (2.52) (and invoking Proposition (2.24)) . Last, assume that there exists a quantum isometric isomorphism $\varphi : (\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathsf{L}_1) \to (\mathfrak{A}_2, \mathsf{L}_2)$. By Definition (2.23), the map φ is a unital *-isomorphism. Define the bridge $\gamma = (\mathfrak{A}_2, 1_{\mathfrak{A}_2}, \varphi, \iota)$ where ι is the identity of $\mathfrak{A}_2$. We check trivially that the length of γ is zero, and thus Property (4) is sufficient as well. ☐

Our quantum propinquity is thus a new metric on the class of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. We now prove that it dominates the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance. The key to this fact is the following construction.

Notation 2.55. The quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance introduced in [40] will be denoted by dist_q.

Theorem 2.56. *Let* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ *and* $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ *be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces. Let* γ *be a bridge from* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ *to* $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$. *Let* $\varepsilon \geqslant 0$ *be chosen so that:*

$$\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) + \varepsilon > 0.$$

Define and for all $(a, b) \in \mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$:

$$\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a, b) = \max\left\{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b), \frac{1}{\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) + \varepsilon}\mathsf{bn}_\gamma\left(a, b\right)\right\}. \tag{2.23}$$

Then L_ε *is an admissible Leibniz Lip-norm for* $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ *and:*

$$\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})) \leqslant 2\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) + \varepsilon. \tag{2.24}$$

Consequently:

$$\mathrm{dist}_q((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) \leqslant 2\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\gamma = (\mathfrak{D}, \omega, \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}, \pi_{\mathfrak{B}})$, and assume $\varepsilon \geqslant 0$ is chosen so that $\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) > 0$. We first prove that $(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\varepsilon)$ is a unital Lipschitz pair. First, note that $\mathsf{bn}_\gamma(\cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$ by construction. In particular, one concludes that the domain of L_ε is dense in $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$.

Second, $\mathsf{bn}_\gamma(1_{\mathfrak{A}}, 0) = \|\omega\|_{\mathfrak{D}} \geqslant 1$, so for any $(a, b) \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, if $\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a, b) = 0$ then $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}(1_{\mathfrak{A}}, 1_{\mathfrak{B}})$. Indeed, if $\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a, b) = 0$ for some $(a, b) \in \mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b) = \mathsf{bn}_\gamma(a, b) = 0$, so there exists $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a = s1_{\mathfrak{A}}$ $b = t1_{\mathfrak{B}}$ as $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ are unital Lipschitz pairs. Thus $\mathsf{bn}_\gamma(s1_{\mathfrak{A}}, t1_{\mathfrak{B}}) = 0$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
|s - t| &= \|\omega\|_{\mathfrak{D}}^{-1}\mathsf{bn}_\gamma\left((s-t)1_{\mathfrak{A}}, 0\right)\\
&= \|\omega\|_{\mathfrak{D}}^{-1}\mathsf{bn}_\gamma\left(s1_{\mathfrak{A}} - t1_{\mathfrak{A}}, t1_{\mathfrak{B}} - t1_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)\\
&\leqslant \|\omega\|_{\mathfrak{D}}^{-1}\left(\mathsf{bn}_\gamma\left(s1_{\mathfrak{A}}, t1_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) + \mathsf{bn}_\gamma\left(t1_{\mathfrak{A}}, t1_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)\right)\\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\mathsf{bn}_\gamma(1_{\mathfrak{A}}, 1_{\mathfrak{B}}) = 0$. Thus $s = t$, i.e. $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}1_{\mathfrak{A}\oplus\mathfrak{B}}$ as claimed. So $(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\varepsilon)$ is a unital Lipschitz pair.

We now prove that L_ε is admissible for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$. Let $a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$. If $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = \infty$ then $\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a,b) = \infty$ for all $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$, so $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = \inf\{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a,b) : b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})\}$ immediately. If, instead, $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = 0$, then $a = t1_{\mathfrak{A}}$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By construction, $\mathsf{bn}_\gamma(t1_{\mathfrak{A}}, t1_{\mathfrak{B}}) = 0$, and thus $\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(t1_{\mathfrak{A}}, t1_{\mathfrak{B}}) = 0$, as desired.

Assume now that $0 < \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) < \infty$, and let $a' = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)^{-1}a$. By definition of $\lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, there exists $b' \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ such that $\mathsf{bn}_\gamma(a', b') \leqslant \lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) + \varepsilon$ and $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b') \leqslant 1$. Thus, if we let $b = \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)b'$ then:

$$\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) \text{ and } \mathsf{bn}_\gamma(a,b) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\left(\lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) + \varepsilon\right).$$

Thus, we have shown:

$$\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) = \inf\{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a,b) : b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})\}.$$

The proof is symmetric in $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$ and thus, we conclude that L is admissible for $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. In particular, the canonical injection of $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ into $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$ is an isometry from $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}$ to $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon}$, and similarly the injection from $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}})$ into $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon})$ is an isometry. We identify $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$ with their images in $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$ for the canonical injections.

By [40, Theorem 5.2], our seminorm L_ε thus constructed is a Lip-norm on $\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}$, which is admissible for $(\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$.

Furthermore, for any $(a,b), (a',b') \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a \circledcirc a', b \circledcirc b') &= \max\left\{ \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a \circledcirc a'), \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b \circledcirc b'), \frac{\mathsf{bn}_\gamma(a \circledcirc a', b \circledcirc b')}{\lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) + \varepsilon} \right\} \\
&\leqslant \max\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}} \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a') + \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\|a'\|_{\mathfrak{A}}, \\
\|b\|_{\mathfrak{B}} \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b') + \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\|b'\|_{\mathfrak{B}}, \\
\dfrac{\|a\|_{\mathfrak{A}}}{\lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) + \varepsilon} \mathsf{bn}_\gamma(a', b') \\
\qquad + \mathsf{bn}_\gamma(a,b) \dfrac{\|b'\|_{\mathfrak{B}}}{\lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) + \varepsilon}
\end{array} \right\} \\
&\leqslant \|(a,b)\|_{\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}} \mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a', b') + \mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a,b)\|(a',b')\|_{\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The same computation holds for the Lie product. Thus $(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\varepsilon)$ is a Leibniz quantum compact metric space.

We now compute the Hausdorff distance between $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$ as subsets of $(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon})$, for the Monge-Kantorovich metric associated with L_ε. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$. By Definition (2.38) and Definition (2.37), there exists $\psi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{D})$ such that $\psi(\omega d) = \psi(d\omega) = \psi(d)$ for all $d \in \mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\varphi, \psi \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}) \leqslant \lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$. Since $\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is the quotient of L on $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$, we conclude that:

$$\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon}(\varphi, \psi \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}) \leqslant \lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}). \tag{2.25}$$

Let $(a,b) \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$ such that $\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a,b) \leqslant 1$. By definition of L_ε, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a) - \psi \circ \pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)| &= |\psi(\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega) - \psi(\omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}})| \\
&\leqslant \|\pi_{\mathfrak{A}}(a)\omega - \omega\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{D}} = \mathsf{bn}_\gamma(a,b) \\
&\leqslant \lambda(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}, \mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Definition (2.6), we have:

$$\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}}(\psi\circ\pi_{\mathfrak{A}},\psi\circ\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}) \leqslant \lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)+\varepsilon. \tag{2.26}$$

Thus, using Inequation (2.25) and (2.26), we have:

$$\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}}(\varphi,\psi\circ\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}) \leqslant 2\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)+\varepsilon.$$

Since $\psi\circ\pi_{\mathfrak{B}}\in\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$ by construction, we have shown that φ lies within the $(2\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)+\varepsilon)$-neighborhood of $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$ for $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon}$. As $\varphi\in\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ was arbitrary, we conclude tat $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$ lies within the $(2\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)+\varepsilon)$-neighborhood of $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})$ for $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon}$. By symmetry in our proof for the roles of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{B}$, we conclude that:

$$\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}),\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})) \leqslant 2\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)+\varepsilon.$$

As $\varepsilon>0$, our theorem is proven. We remark that if $\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right)>0$ then we can pick $\varepsilon=0$, and thus we have an admissible Lip-norm L_0 which makes the bound in our theorem sharp. □

We can now prove the following important result:

Corollary 2.57. *For any pair* $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$, $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ *of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, we have:*

$$\mathrm{dist}_q((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) \leqslant 2\Lambda((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})).$$

In particular, convergence of a net for the quantum propinquity implies convergence of the same net to the same limit for the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon>0$. By Definition (2.43), there exists a trek

$$\Gamma=(\mathfrak{A}_j,\mathsf{L}_j,\gamma_j,\mathfrak{A}_{j+1},\mathsf{L}_{j+1}:j=1,\ldots,n)$$

such that:

$$\lambda\left(\Gamma\right)\leqslant\Lambda((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}))+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Now, since dist_q satisfies the triangle inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{dist}_q((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})) &\leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{dist}_q((\mathfrak{A}_j,\mathsf{L}_j),(\mathfrak{A}_{j+1},\mathsf{L}_{j+1}))\\ &\leqslant 2\sum_{j=1}^{n}\lambda\left(\gamma_j|\mathsf{L}_j,\mathsf{L}_{j+1}\right)\text{ by Theorem (2.56),}\\ &\leqslant 2\Lambda((\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}),(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}))+\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon>0$, we have proven our corollary. □

Remark 2.58. For any class C of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, the C-specialized quantum propinquity dominates the quantum propinquity, so Theorem (2.56) and its Corollary (2.57) apply to Λ_C as well.

As a remark, we can of course construct natural Lip-norms which gives us the result of Corollary (2.57). Let $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ be two Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces, and Γ be a trek from $(\mathfrak{A},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $(\mathfrak{B},\mathsf{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$. Write $\Gamma=(\mathfrak{A}_j,\mathsf{L}_j,\gamma_j,\mathfrak{A}_{j+1},\mathsf{L}_{j+1}:j=1,\ldots,n)$. For any $\varepsilon>0$, define:

$$\mathsf{tn}_{\Gamma,\varepsilon}(a,b) = \inf\left\{ \max\left\{ \frac{\mathsf{bn}_{\gamma_j}(\eta_j, \eta_{j+1})}{\lambda\left(\gamma_j \middle| \mathsf{L}_j, \mathsf{L}_{j+1}\right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{n}} \right\} : \eta \in \mathscr{Itineraries}\left(a \xrightarrow{\Gamma} b\right) \right\}.$$

Then define, for all $(a,b) \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$:

$$\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon(a,b) = \max\{\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}(a), \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}(b), \mathsf{tn}_{\Gamma,\varepsilon}(a,b)\}.$$

Then the reader may check that L_ε is an admissible Lip-norm on $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A} \oplus \mathfrak{B})$ for $(\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$. Moreover, if Γ is chosen as in the proof of Corollary (2.57), then:

$$\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_\varepsilon}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}), \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{B})) \leqslant 2\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})) + \varepsilon.$$

Yet, even though $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}$ are Leibniz, the Lip-norm L_ε may not be. However, in this case, we can find finitely many Leibniz Lip-norms and intermediate Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces given by Theorem (2.56) to connect $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A})$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B})$.

A careful inspection of the proof of Theorem (2.52) reveals that the key to our quantum propinquity's behavior is that it provides not only a control on the Lip-norms, but also a control on the norms of elements. More precisely, we get the following quantum version of the Lipschitz extension property: if

$$\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}, \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}), (\mathfrak{B}, \mathsf{L}_B)) = d,$$

then for all $a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{B})$ such that:

$$\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}(b) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}(a) \text{ and } \|b\|_\mathfrak{B} \leqslant \|a\|_\mathfrak{A} + 2\mathsf{L}(a)(d+\varepsilon),$$

using Equation (2.8). Thus, we have some control on how far from Leibniz the trek norms are.

Remark 2.59. We note that the Lip-norms constructed in Theorem (2.56) are strong Leibniz if $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{A}$, $\mathsf{L}_\mathfrak{B}$ are strong Leibniz, using the notations of (2.56). Thus, the quantum propinquity provides strong Leibniz Lip-norm. However, Rieffel's proximity [36] does not satisfy, as far as we know, the triangle inequality, so it is unclear whether the quantum propinquity dominates Rieffel's proximity.

We conclude this section by comparing the quantum propinquity with the Gromov-Hausdorff distance. It is proven in [40] that the Gromov-Hausdorff distance dominates the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance restricted to the compact quantum metric spaces given by Example (2.8). Thus Theorem (2.57) is not enough to compare our quantum propinquity with the Gromov-Hausdorff distance. Yet, we have:

Theorem 2.60. *Let* (X, d_X) *and* (Y, d_Y) *be two compact metric spaces, and let* GH *be the Gromov-Hausdorff distance* [12]. *Then:*

$$\Lambda((C(X), \mathsf{L}_X), (C(Y), \mathsf{L}_Y)) \leqslant \mathsf{GH}((X, \mathsf{d}_X), (Y, \mathsf{d}_Y)),$$

where L_X *and* L_Y *are, respectively, the Lipschitz seminorms associated to* d_X *and* d_Y.

Proof. Let $\delta = \mathsf{GH}((X, \mathsf{d}_X), (Y, \mathsf{d}_Y))$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By definition of the Gromov-Hausdorff distance, there exists a distance d on the disjoint union $X \coprod Y$ of X and

Y which restricts to d_X on X and d_Y on Y, and such that the Hausdorff distance for d between X and Y is less than $\delta+\varepsilon$.

$$Z = \{(x,y) \in X \times Y : \mathsf{d}(x,y) \leqslant \delta + 2\varepsilon\}.$$

We endow Z with the restriction of the product topology on $X \times Y$. Thus, Z is easily checked to be compact, and moreover, by our choice of δ and d, the canonical surjection $X \times Y \twoheadrightarrow X$ and $X \times Y \twoheadrightarrow Y$ are still surjections when restricted to Z, which we denote, respectively, by ρ_X and ρ_Y. We define $\pi_X : f \in C(X) \mapsto f \circ \rho_X$ and $\pi_Y : f \in C(Y) \mapsto f \circ \rho_Y$. Thus, by definition, $\gamma = (C(Z), 1, \pi_X, \pi_Y)$ is a bridge, whose height is null by construction.

Let $f \in \mathfrak{sa}(C(X))$ with $\mathsf{L}_X(f) \leqslant 1$. Let $\tilde{f} : X \coprod Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a 1-Lipschitz extension of f to $(X \coprod Y, \mathsf{d})$. Let g be the restriction of $\tilde{f}$ to Y and note that $\mathsf{L}_Y(g) \leqslant 1$. We have, for all $(x,y) \in Z$:

$$|f(x) - g(y)| = |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(y)| \leqslant \mathsf{d}(x,y) \leqslant \delta + 2\varepsilon.$$

Hence, $\lambda\left(\gamma|\mathsf{L}_X, \mathsf{L}_Y\right) \leqslant \delta + 2\varepsilon$. As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we have proven our theorem. ☐

Remark 2.61. Let C be a class of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces which include all the Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces given by Example (2.8). Then Theorem (2.60) adapts immediately to Λ_C as well.

3. CONTINUITY FOR QUANTUM TORI AND FUZZY TORI

Our main examples of convergence for our quantum propinquity Λ are provided by quantum tori, and their finite approximations, in the spirit of [20]. While essential to our present construction, the work carried out in [20] and [40] is not sufficient to conclude that quantum tori form a continuous family for our quantum propinquity. Instead, we propose a new proof in this section, which may serve as a guide to future proofs involving the quantum propinquity and continuous fields of C*-algebras with quantum metric structures. We start with a brief review of the quantum tori and fuzzy tori and their noncommutative metric structures. We then provide a family of representations of quantum and fuzzy tori which are well-behaved with respect to the strong operator topology. The last section constructs a family of bridges which allow us to conclude the desired result.

3.1. Quantum and Fuzzy Tori.

This preliminary subsection contains a brief summary of the various facts and notations we will use in our work with quantum and fuzzy tori.

Notation 3.1. Let $\mathbb{N}_* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0,1\}$.

Notation 3.2. Let $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_* = \mathbb{N}_* \cup \{\infty\}$ be the one-point compactification of $\mathbb{N}_*$. For any $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k = (k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_d) \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$, we set:

$$k\mathbb{Z}^d = \prod_{j=1}^{d} k_j \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Z}_k^d = \mathbb{Z}^d \left/ k\mathbb{Z}^d \right. ,$$

with the convention that $\infty\mathbb{Z} = \{0\}$. The Pontryagin dual of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$ is denoted by $\mathbb{U}_k^d$. In particular, if $k \in \mathbb{N}^d$ then $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$ is finite and thus self-dual. However, we shall always consider $\mathbb{U}_k^d$ as a compact subgroup of the d-torus $\mathbb{U}^d = \mathbb{U}^d_{(\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$, where $\mathbb{U} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ is the unitary group of $\mathbb{C}$.

Notation 3.3. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$. The set of all skew-bicharacters of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$ is denoted by $\mathbb{B}_k^d$. We define:

$$\Xi^d = \left\{ (k,\sigma) : k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d \text{ and } \sigma \in \mathbb{B}_k^d \right\}.$$

We identify Ξ^d with the subset of $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d \times \mathbb{B}^d_{(\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$ consisting of pairs (k,σ) such that σ is the unique lift of an element of $\mathbb{B}_k^d$ to $\mathbb{B}_{(\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$. With this identification, Ξ^d is topologized as a topological subspace of $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d \times \mathbb{B}^d_{(\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$ endowed with the product topology, where $\mathbb{B}^d_{(\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$ endowed with the topology of pointwise convergence.

By [18], we can identify $\mathbb{B}^d_{(\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$, endowed with the topology of pointwise convergence, with:

$$\Theta = \left\{ e^{2i\pi A} : A \text{ is a } d \times d \text{ anti-symmetric matrix with real entries} \right\}$$

endowed with its usual topology as a subset of $d \times d$ matrices over $\mathbb{C}$. In particular, $\mathfrak{B}^1_\infty$ can be identified with $\mathbb{U}$, or equivalently, with ${}^{\mathbb{R}}/_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Thus $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d \times \mathbb{B}^d_{(\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$ is naturally isomorphic to $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d \times \Theta$. In particular, it is a compact set, and as Ξ^d is easily checked to be closed, it is a compact set as well.

For any discrete set E and any $p \in [1,\infty)$, the set $\ell^p(E)$ is the set of all p-summable complex valued families over E, endowed with the norm:

$$\|\xi\|_p = \left(\sum_{x \in E} |\xi_x|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for all $\xi \in \ell^p(E)$.

The main objects of this section of our paper are quantum and fuzzy tori, which are the enveloping C*-algebras of *-algebras defined by twisting the convolution products on finite products of cyclic groups as follows. We refer to [43] for a general reference on twisted convolution C*-algebras of discrete groups, and to [29, 30] for a survey on quantum tori and their role in noncommutative geometry.

Definition 3.4. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$ and σ a skew bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$. The *twisted convolution product* on $\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$ of any $f, g \in \ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$ is:

$$f *_{k,\sigma} g : n \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d \longmapsto \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d} f(m) g(n-m) \sigma(m,n).$$

For any $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$ and any skew-bicharacter σ of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$, the 2-cocycle identity satisfied by σ implies $\left(\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right), *_{k,\sigma}\right)$ is indeed an associative algebra; moreover, this algebra carries a natural involution:

Definition 3.5. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. For any $f \in \ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$, we define the *adjoint* f^* of f by:

$$f^* : n \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d \longmapsto \overline{f(-n)}.$$

For any $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d$, one checks easily that $\left(\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right), *_\sigma, \cdot^*\right)$ is a *-algebra , and we now wish to construct its enveloping C*-algebra: to do so, we shall choose a natural faithful *-representation of $\left(\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right), *_\sigma, \cdot^*\right)$ on $\ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$.

For any set E, the Banach space $\ell^2(E)$ is a indeed Hilbert space for the inner product:

$$\xi, \eta \in \ell^2(E) \longmapsto \langle \xi, \eta \rangle = \sum_{x \in E} \overline{\xi_x}\eta_x$$

The canonical Hilbert basis of $\ell^2(E)$ is given by $(e_x)_{x\in E}$ where:

$$e_x : y \in E \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } y = x \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The concrete C*-algebra of all bounded linear operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ will be denoted simply as $\mathfrak{B}^d$. We shall denote the norm for bounded linear operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d}$.

Notation 3.6. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$ and σ be a skew-bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d$, we define the operator $U_{k,\sigma}^n$ as the unique bounded linear operator of $\ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$ such that:

$$U_{k,\sigma}^n e_m = \sigma(n,m)e_{m-n}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d$, where $(e_m)_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_k^d}$ is the canonical Hilbert basis of $\ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$.

For any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{k,\sigma}^n U_{k,\sigma}^m e_j &= U_{k,\sigma}^n \sigma(m,j)e_{j-m} \\ &= \sigma(n, j-m)\sigma(m,j)e_{j-m-n} \\ &= \overline{\sigma(n,m)}\sigma(n,j)\sigma(m,j)e_{j-m-n} = \overline{\sigma(n,m)}\sigma(n+m,j)e_{j-(m+n)} \\ &= \overline{\sigma(n,m)}U_{k,\sigma}^{n+m}e_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d \mapsto U_{k,\sigma}^n$ is a σ-projective unitary representation of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$ on $\ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$. Naturally, its integrated representation defines a *-representation for the *-algebra $(\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d), *_{k,\sigma}, \cdot^*)$:

Theorem 3.7. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$ and σ be a skew bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$. The map:*

$$\rho_{k,\sigma} : f \in \ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right) \longmapsto \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_k^d} f(n)U_{k,\sigma}^n$$

*is a faithful *-representation of the *-algebra $\left(\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right), *_{k,\sigma}, \cdot^*\right)$ on $\ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$. In other words, for all $f, g \in \ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$, we have:*

$$\rho_{k,\sigma}(f)\rho_{k,\sigma}(g) = \rho_{k,\sigma}(f *_{k,\sigma} g).$$

Proof. This is a standard result [43]. ☐

Definition 3.8. The C*-algebra $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d, \sigma\right)$ is the norm closure of $\rho_\sigma\left(\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)\right)$.

Notation 3.9. The norm of $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$ is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{k,\sigma}$. In proofs, we will often abbreviate the standard notation for $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$ by $\mathfrak{A}_{k,\sigma}$.

As a matter of terminology, the C*-algebras $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d,\sigma\right)$ are called *quantum tori*. For $k\in\mathbb{N}^d_*$, the C*-algebra $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$ is called a *fuzzy torus*, and are finite sums of matrix algebras.

Notation 3.10. We shall identify $f\in\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k\right)$ with $\rho_{k,\sigma}(f)$ whenever no confusion may arise, for any $(k,\sigma)\in\Xi^d$, since $\rho_{k,\sigma}$ is faithful.

Remark 3.11. Technically, we have defined the *reduced* C*-algebra of $\mathbb{Z}^d_k$ twisted by σ, but since our groups are Abelian, they are amenable, and thus our definition also coincides with the full C*-algebra of $\mathbb{Z}^d_k$ twisted by σ.

Quantum and fuzzy tori carry natural group actions, from which we shall derive their metric geometry from a kind of transport of structure. For all $\omega=(\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_d)\in\mathbb{U}^d_k$ and $n=(n_1\ldots,n_d)\in\mathbb{Z}^d_k$, we shall denote $\left(\omega_1^{n_1},\ldots,\omega_d^{n_d}\right)$ by ω^n, so that $(\omega,n)\in\mathbb{U}^d_k\times\mathbb{Z}^d_k\mapsto\omega^n$ is the Pontryagin duality pairing. We quote the following two results which define the quantum metric space structure of quantum and fuzzy tori as quantum homogeneous spaces of the torus and its compact subgroups.

Theorem-Definition 3.12. [43] *Let $d\in\mathbb{N}_*$, $k\in\overline{\mathbb{N}}^d_*$ and σ a skew-bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}^d_k$. For all $\omega\in\mathbb{U}^d_k$, there exists a unique *-automorphism $\alpha^\omega_{k,\sigma}$ of $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$ such that for any $f\in\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d_k)$ and any $n\in\mathbb{Z}^d_k$, we have:*

$$\alpha^\omega_{k,\sigma}(f)(n)=\omega^n f(n).$$

The map $\omega\in\mathbb{U}^d_k\mapsto\alpha^\omega_{k,\sigma}$ is a strongly continuous action of $\mathbb{U}^d_k$ on $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$. This action is called the dual action *of $\mathbb{U}^d_k$ on $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$.*

Theorem-Definition 3.13. [31] *Let $d\in\mathbb{N}_*$, $k\in\overline{\mathbb{N}}^d_*$, σ a skew-bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}^d_k$ and l be a continuous length function on $\mathbb{U}^d_k$. Let α be the dual action of $\mathbb{U}^d_k$ on $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$. For all $a\in C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right)$, we set:*

$$\mathsf{L}_{l,k,\sigma}(a)=\sup\left\{\frac{\|a-\alpha^\omega_{k,\sigma}(a)\|_{k,\sigma}}{l(\omega)}:\omega\in\mathbb{U}^d_k\setminus\{1\}\right\},$$

where 1 is the unit of $\mathbb{U}^d_k$. Then $\left(C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k,\sigma\right),\mathsf{L}_{l,k,\sigma}\right)$ is a Leibniz quantum compact metric space.

Remark 3.14. Any subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is isomorphic to a group $k\mathbb{Z}^d$ for some $k\in\mathbb{N}^d_*$, via an invertible $\mathbb{Z}$-module map of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. By functoriality of twisted C*-algebras of groups, we see that we can always adjust the situation so that, whatever subgroups we may consider in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, our current work applies, up to obvious changes to the metric. The current setup makes the computations more approachable.

We conclude this section with a fundamental approximation result which makes essential use of the metric geometry of quantum tori. This result was proven in [20], and it will be quite useful in our current work, so we present briefly the general scheme of its proof. We start with the following definition:

Definition 3.15. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$ and σ a skew bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$. For any continuous function $\phi : \mathbb{U}_k^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set:

$$\alpha^{\phi}_{k,\sigma} : a \in C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d, \sigma\right) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{U}_k^d} \phi(\omega)\alpha^{\omega}_{k,\sigma}(a)\, d\lambda_k(\omega),$$

where λ_k is the Haar probability measure on $\mathbb{U}_k^d$.

Theorem 3.16. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. Let l be a continuous length function on $\mathbb{U}_k^d$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists a positive, continuous function $\phi : \mathbb{U}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a neighborhood U of k in $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$ such that:*

1. *For all $c \in U$, all skew-bicharacter σ of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$ and for all $a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathbb{C}^*(\mathbb{Z}_c^d, \sigma))$ we have $\|a - \alpha^{\phi}_{c,\sigma}(a)\|_{c,\sigma} \leqslant \varepsilon \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(a)$ and $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\sigma}(a)) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(a)$,*
2. *There exists a finite subset S of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that, for all $c \in U$ and any skew-bicharacter σ of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$, the restriction of the canonical surjection $q_k : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_c^d$ is injective on S, the range of $\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\sigma}$ is the span of $\{U^p_{k,\sigma} : p \in q_k(S)\}$, while $0 \in S$.*

Due to the importance of this result, we provide a sketch of its proof based upon the following three lemmas, proven in greater generality in [20].

Lemma 3.17. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. Let $f : \mathbb{U}_k^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous function such that $f(1, \ldots, 1) = 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists a finite linear combination ϕ of characters of $\mathbb{U}_k^d$, including the trivial character, such that $\phi \geqslant 0$, $\int_{\mathbb{U}^d} \phi\, d\lambda_k = 1$ and $\int_{\mathbb{U}^d} \phi|f|\, d\lambda_k \leqslant \varepsilon$.*

Proof. See [20, Lemma 3.1], where the compact group G is chosen to be $\mathbb{U}_k^d$. ☐

Lemma 3.18. *If ϕ is a linear combination of characters of $\mathbb{U}_k^d$, then the range of α^{ϕ} is the span of $\{U^p_{k,\sigma} : \widehat{\phi}(p) \neq 0\}$, where $\widehat{\phi}$ is the Fourier transform of ϕ. In particular, α^{ϕ} has finite rank.*

Proof. See [20, Lemma 3.2], with $\Sigma = \mathbb{U}_k^d$. ☐

Lemma 3.19. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. If $f : \mathbb{U}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a continuous function, then:*

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow k} \int_{\mathbb{U}_c^d} f\, d\lambda_c = \int_{\mathbb{U}_k^d} f\, d\lambda_k,$$

where λ_c is meant for the probability Haar measure on $\mathbb{U}_c^d$ for all $c \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$.

Proof. This is [20, Lemma 3.6] in the case of $G = \mathbb{U}_k$. ☐

Sketch of proof of Theorem (3.16). Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By Lemma (3.17), there exists a finite linear combination ϕ of characters of $\mathbb{U}_k^d$ such that $\phi \geqslant 0$, $\int_{\mathbb{U}_k^d} \phi\, d\lambda_k = 1$ and:

$$\int_{\mathbb{U}_k^d} \phi(\omega) l(\omega)\, d\lambda_k(\omega) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon.$$

Let $S = \{p \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \widehat{\phi}(p) \neq 0\}$, where $\widehat{\phi} : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ is the Fourier transform on ϕ. Note that $0 \in S$ and S is finite.

By Lemma (3.19), there exists a neighborhood U of k in $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$ such that:

$$\int_{\mathbb{U}_c^d} \phi(\omega) l(\omega)\, d\lambda_c(\omega) \leqslant \varepsilon.$$

Let $c \in U$ and σ be a skew bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$. By Lemma (3.18), the operator $\alpha_{c,\sigma}^{\phi}$ has range the span of $\{U_{c,\sigma}^p : p \in S\}$, and since ϕ is positive, the linear map $\alpha_{c,\sigma}^{\phi}$ is positive. Let $a \in \mathfrak{A}_{c,\sigma}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a - \alpha_{c,\sigma}^{\phi}(a)\|_{c,\sigma} &\leqslant \int_{\mathbb{U}_c^d} \|a - \alpha_{c,\sigma}^{\omega}(a)\|_{c,\sigma} \phi(\omega)\, d\lambda_c(\omega) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{U}_c^d} \frac{\|a - \alpha_{c,\sigma}^{\omega}(a)\|_{c,\sigma}}{l(\omega)} l(\omega)\phi(\omega)\, d\lambda_c(\omega) \\
&\leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(a) \int_{\mathbb{U}_c^d} \phi(\omega) l(\omega)\, d\lambda_c(\omega) \\
&\leqslant \varepsilon \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(a).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using lower-semicontinuity and invariance for the dual action of the Lip-norm $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(\alpha^{\phi}(a)) &\leqslant \int_{\mathbb{U}_c^d} \phi(\omega) \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(\alpha_{c,\theta}^{\omega}(a))\, d\lambda_c(\omega) \\
&= \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\sigma}(a) \int_{\mathbb{U}_c^d} \varphi\, d\lambda_c = \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves our theorem. □

3.2. **Continuous fields.** An important feature of the quantum and fuzzy tori is that they can be seen as fibers of a single continuous field of C*-algebras [20, Corollary 2.9]. For our purpose, we need a concrete construction of such a field, which goes beyond our groupoid-based construction in [20]. In this section, for a fix $d \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$, we introduce faithful non-degenerate *-representations of the C*-algebras $\mathbb{C}^*\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d, \sigma\right)$ for $(k, \sigma) \in \Xi^d$ on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, in such a way that, informally, these representations are pointwise continuous for the strong operator topology. The precise statement will require some notations, to be found in this section.

For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the integer $\lfloor x \rfloor$ and $\lceil x \rceil$ are, respectively, the largest integer smaller than x and the smallest integer larger than x. Moreover, we use the conventions $\lfloor \pm\infty \rfloor = \lceil \pm\infty \rceil = \pm\infty$, and $\pm\infty + n = n + \pm\infty = m(\pm\infty) = \pm\infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \in (0, \infty) \in \mathbb{R}$.

We start with the following simple object:

Notation 3.20. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*$. Let:

$$I_k = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{1-k_j}{2} \right\rfloor, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{k_j - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}.$$

We observe that, by construction, the set:

$$\mathscr{P}_k = \left\{ I_k + n : n \in k\mathbb{Z}^d \right\} \tag{3.1}$$

is a partition of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. This is not the usual partition of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ in cosets of $k\mathbb{Z}^d$, but we will find it a bit more convenient (though one could, at the expense of worse notations later on, work with the standard partition of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ in cosets of $k\mathbb{Z}^d$).

Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. The canonical surjection $q_k : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{Z}_k^d$ restricts to a bijection from I_k onto $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$. We thus can define an isometric embedding $\vartheta_k : \ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ by setting for all $\xi \in \ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$:

$$\vartheta_k(\xi) : n \in \mathbb{Z}^d \longmapsto \begin{cases} \xi(q_k(n)) \text{ if } n \in I_k \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

Since ϑ_k is an isometry by construction, $\vartheta_k^* \vartheta_k$ is the identity of $\ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$. Therefore, for all skew bicharacter σ of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$, the map $\vartheta_k \pi_{k,\sigma}(\cdot)\vartheta_k^*$ is a *non-unital* *-representation of $C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d, \sigma\right)$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. To construct a non-degenerate representation, we proceed as follows. Since $\mathscr{P}_k$, defined by Equation (3.1), is a partition of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we have the following decomposition of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in an orthogonal direct sum:

$$\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \bigoplus_{n \in k\mathbb{Z}^d} \operatorname{span}\{e_j : j \in I_k + n\} \tag{3.3}$$

with $(e_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ the canonical basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ given by $e_m(n) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $e_m(n) = 1$ if and only if $n = m$, for all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Note that the range of ϑ_k is $\operatorname{span}\{e_j : j \in I_k\}$.

For all $n \in k\mathbb{Z}^d$, let u_n be the unitary from $\operatorname{span}\{e_j : j \in I_k\}$ onto $\operatorname{span}\{e_j : j \in I_k + n\}$ by extending linearly the map:

$$e_j \in \{e_m : m \in I_k\} \longmapsto e_{j+n}.$$

We now define:

Notation 3.21. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. Let σ be a skew-bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$, and $\rho_{k,\sigma}$ the representation on $\left(\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right), *_{k,\sigma}, \cdot^*\right)$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ defined by Theorem (3.7).

Let $\xi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and write $\xi = \sum_{j \in k\mathbb{Z}^d} \xi_j$ with $\xi_j \in \operatorname{span}\{e_m : m \in I_k + j\}$. Such a decomposition is unique by Equation (3.3). Define for all $a \in C^*(\mathbb{Z}_k^d, \sigma)$:

$$\pi_{k,\sigma}(a)\xi = \sum_{j \in k\mathbb{Z}^d} u_j \vartheta \rho_{k,\sigma}(a) \vartheta^* u_j^* \xi_j, \tag{3.4}$$

which is well-defined since $\|u_n \vartheta \rho_{k,\sigma}(a) \vartheta^* u_j^* \xi_j\|_2 \leqslant \|a\|_{k,\sigma} \|\xi_j\|_2$ for all $j \in k\mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\sum_{j \in kZ^d} \|\xi_j\|_2^2 = \|\xi\|_2^2 < \infty$ by definition of ξ.

It is easy to check that $\pi_{k,\sigma}$ thus defined is a faithful, non-degenerate (i.e. unital) *-representation of $C^*(\mathbb{Z}_k^d, \sigma)$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, which acts "diagonally" in the decomposition of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ given by Equation (3.3).

The representations introduced in Notation (3.21) enjoy an important topological property with respect to the strong operator topology of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. To make this statement precise, we first need a way to see an element of $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ as an element of $\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k\right)$ for any $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}^d_*$ as follows.

Notation 3.22. For any $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}^d_*$, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d_k$, we define the element δ_m of $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d_k)$ by:

$$\delta_m : n \in \mathbb{Z}^d_k \longmapsto \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } n = m, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that we defined the canonical basis $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in such a way that $e_n = \delta_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, so one may find our present notation redundant. However, it will make our exposition much clearer if we distinguish between the vectors $e_n \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and the functions $\delta_n \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Lemma 3.23. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}^d_*$. Let $q_k : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{Z}^d_k$ be the canonical surjection. For any $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define:*

$$v'_k(f)(n) = \sum_{m\in k\mathbb{Z}^d} f(m+n) \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Then $v'_k(f)(n) = v'_k(f)(m)$ for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $q_k(n) = q_k(m)$. Thus there exists a unique function $v_k(f) : \mathbb{Z}^d_k \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $v_k(f) \circ q_k = v'_k(f)$. The linear map v_k thus defined has norm 1, and $v_k(f^*) = v_k(f)^*$.

The function v_k is a linear surjection. Moreover, the restriction of v_k to the functions in $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ supported on I_k is injective.

Proof. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $q_k(m) = q_k(n)$, i.e. such that $n - m \in k\mathbb{Z}^d$. Thus $\sum_{v\in k\mathbb{Z}^d} f(n+v) = \sum_{v\in k\mathbb{Z}^d} f(m + ((n-m)+v)) = \sum_{v\in k\mathbb{Z}^d} f(m+v)$ as desired. Hence v_k is well-defined, and linearity is straightforward, as well as self-adjointness. Now, the function $\vartheta_k : \ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k\right) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ defined in Equation (3.2) restricted to $\ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_k\right)$ is a function with values in $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and we check that $v_k(\vartheta_k(g)) = g$.

Last, assume that we are given a function $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ whose support is contained in I_k such that $v_k(f) = 0$, which is equivalent by definition to $v'_k(f) = 0$. Now, again by definition:

$$0 = v'_k(f)(n) = \sum_{v\in k\mathbb{Z}^d} f(n+v) = f(n)$$

for all $n \in I_k$. Thus $f = 0$ as desired. It is easy to check that $v_k(f) \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d_k)$ for $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ — in fact v_k is easily seen to be of norm 1. □

We will find it convenient to use the following notation across this section, with its first appearance in the proof of the main theorem which follows. Thus we set it up now:

Notation 3.24. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}^d_*$. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define $[n \mod I_k]$ and $[n|I_k]$ as the unique integers such that:

$$n - [n|I_k] = [n \mod I_k] \text{ with } [n|I_k] \in k\mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and } [n \mod I_k] \in I_k.$$

This notation differs slightly from the usual meaning of the $\mod$ operator, as it refers to the partition $\mathscr{P}_k$ of Equation (3.1) rather than the partition of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ in cosets for $k\mathbb{Z}^d$. However, this will prove a convenient notation, and is related to our choice in Notation (3.21). We relate our mod operation to the usual one in the following manner. For $d = 1$ an $k \in \mathbb{N}_*$, if $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n = qk + r$ for $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $|r| < k$, then:

- If $r \in I_k$ then $[n \mod I_k] = r$,
- If $r \in \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor + 1, \ldots, k-1 \right\}$ then $[n \mod I_k] = r - k$,
- If $r \in \left\{ -k+1, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{1-k}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right\}$ then $[n \mod I_k] = r + k$.

If $d = 1$ and $k = \infty$ then $[n \mod I_k] = n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The general computation of $[n \mod I_k]$, for arbitrary $d, k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is simply carried on componentwise using the above calculations for $d = 1$.

Note that by construction, if p_k is the inverse function of the restriction of the canonical surjection $q_k : \mathbb{Z}^d \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_k^d$ to I_k, then $[n \mod I_k] = p_k \circ q_k(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. In particular, we note for all $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have:

$$[[n \mod I_k] - [m \mod I_k] \mod I_k] = [n - m \mod I_k], \tag{3.5}$$

since $q_k \circ p_k$ is the identity on $\mathbb{Z}_k^d$.

Remark 3.25. Let $(k, \sigma) \in \Xi^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$. Identify σ with its unique lift as a skew bicharacter of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. By construction, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_k^d$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(m,n) = \sigma([m \mod I_k], n) = \sigma(m, [n \mod I_k]) \\ = \sigma([m \mod I_k], [n \mod I_k]).\end{aligned}$$

We now can state the key result of this section:

Theorem 3.26. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d$. Let $(k_n, \sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in Ξ^d converging to (k, σ). If $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, then $(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}(v_{k_n}(f)))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\pi_{k,\sigma}(v_k(f))$ in the strong operator topology of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, where $v_c : \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d) \to \ell^1\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d\right)$ is defined in Lemma (3.23).*

Proof. For any $c \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$, the canonical surjection $\mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{Z}_c^d$ is denoted by q_c. We write $k = (k^1, \ldots, k^d)$ and $k_n = (k_n^1, \ldots, k_n^d)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We identify the skew-bicharacters σ and σ_n, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with their unique lift to skew-bicharacters of $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $\delta_m \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ be 1 at m and zero everywhere else, and let $(e_r)_{r\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be the canonical Hilbert basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. A quick computation shows that $v_c(\delta_m) = v_c\left(\delta_{[m \mod I_c]}\right)$ for all $c \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. Moreover, from Equation (3.4) in Notation (3.21) as well as Equation (3.5) and Remark (3.25), we have for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:

$$\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}(v_{k_n}(\delta_m))e_r = \sigma_n(m,r)e_{[r-m \mod I_{k_n}]+[r|I_{k_n}]}. \tag{3.6}$$

We keep $m, r \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ fixed for now. Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. We have one of the following two cases:

- If $k^j = \infty$, then there exists $N_{r,m,j} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geqslant N_{r,m,j}$ we have $k^j_n > 2|r_j - m_j|$ and $k^j_n > |r_j|$, and thus:
$$\left[r_j - m_j \mod I_{k^n_j}\right] = r_j - m_j = \left[r_j - m_j \mod I_{k^j}\right]$$
and
$$\left[r_j \middle| I_{k^n_j}\right] = \left[r_j \middle| I_{k_j}\right] = 0$$
for all $n \geqslant N_{r,m,j}$.
- If $k^j \in \mathbb{N}_*$ then the sequence $(k^j_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, which lies in $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*$, is eventually constant. Thus, there exists $N_{r,m,j} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k^j_n = k^j$ for all $n \geqslant N_{r,m,j}$. Consequently, we have $\left[r_j - m_j \mod I_{k^n_j}\right] = \left[r_j - m_j \mod I_{k^j}\right]$ and $\left[r_j \middle| I_{k^n_j}\right] = \left[r_j \middle| I_k\right]$ for all $j \geqslant N_{r,m,j}$.

Thus, there exists $N_{r,m} = \max\{N_{r,m,1}, \ldots, N_{r,m,d}\}$ such that, for all $n \geqslant N$, we have $[r - m \mod I_{k^n}] = [r - m \mod I_k]$ and $[r|I_{k^n}] = [r|I_k]$.

We thus have, by Equation (3.6), for $n \geqslant N_{r,m}$:
$$\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}\left(\delta_m\right)\right) e_r - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k\left(\delta_m\right)\right) e_r = (\sigma_n(m,r) - \sigma(m,r)) e_{[r-m \mod I_k]+[r|I_k]}.$$
The sequence $(\sigma_n(m,r) - \sigma(m,r))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to 0 by assumption. Hence:
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\left(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}\left(\delta_m\right)\right) - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k\left(\delta_m\right)\right)\right) e_r\|_2 = 0.$$

Let now $\xi = (\xi_r)_{r\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Then, using Pythagorean theorem (since $\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n} - \pi_{k,\sigma}$ maps the canonical basis to an orthogonal family):
$$\begin{aligned}\|\left(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}\left(\delta_m\right)\right) - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k\left(\delta_m\right)\right)\right)\xi\|_2^2 &= \sum_{r\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |\xi_r|^2 \|(\sigma_n(m,r) - \sigma(m,r)) e_{[r-m \mod I_k]+[r|I_k]}\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{r\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |\xi_r|^2 |\sigma_n(m,r) - \sigma(m,r)|^2.\end{aligned}$$
Now, since all bicharacters are valued in $\mathbb{U}$, we have:
$$|\xi_r|^2 |\sigma_n(m,r) - \sigma(m,r)|^2 \leqslant 4|\xi_r|^2 \text{ and } \sum_{r\in\mathbb{Z}^d} 4|\xi_r|^2 = 4\|\xi\|_2^2 < \infty.$$
The Lebesgues dominated convergence theorem applies, and we conclude that:
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\|\left(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}\left(\delta_m\right)\right) - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k\left(\delta_m\right)\right)\right)\xi\right\|_2 = 0, \tag{3.7}$$
as desired. Now, since v_k and the maps v_{k_n}, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are continuous and linear, we immediately get:
$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}\left(f\right)\right) - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k\left(f\right)\right)\right)\xi\right\|_2 \\ &\qquad \leqslant \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f(m)| \left\|\left(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}\left(\delta_m\right)\right) - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k\left(\delta_m\right)\right)\right)\xi\right\|_2\end{aligned}$$
for all $\xi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Since $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and, for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:
$$|f(m)| \left\|\left(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}\left(\delta_m\right)\right) - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k\left(\delta_m\right)\right)\right)\xi\right\|_2 \leqslant 2|f(m)| \|\xi\|_2,$$

the Lebesgues dominated convergence theorem implies that:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\|\left(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}\left(v_{k_n}(f)\right) - \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(v_k(f)\right)\right)\xi\right\|_2 = 0$$

for all $\xi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ by Equation (3.7), as desired. □

It is easy to check that, in general, we can not strengthen Theorem (3.26) by replacing the strong operator topology with the norm topology. This is, in turn, where using our notion of bridge, rather than the distance in norm between the Lipschitz balls, will prove very useful. As a hint of things to come, we prove the following results.

Notation 3.27. Let $\mathfrak{L}_1$ be the ideal of trace-class operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, whose norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}$. We denote the standard trace on $\mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d))$ by tr and we recall that $\|A\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} = \mathrm{tr}(|A|)$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{L}_1$, with $|A| = (A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Lemma 3.28. *Let $\mathscr{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space and $(T_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of operators on $\mathscr{H}$ and T an operator on $\mathscr{H}$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. *The sequence $(T_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to T in the strong operator topology,*
2. *For all compact operators A on $\mathscr{H}$, we have:*
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|(T_n - T)A\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} = 0,$$
3. *For all trace-class operators A on $\mathscr{H}$, we have:*
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|(T_n - T)A\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} = 0.$$

Proof. Assume that $(T_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to T in the strong operator topology. By the uniform boundedness principle, $(T_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}$ be chosen so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\|T_n - T\| \leqslant M$.

First, if A is a rank one operator and if $\xi \in \mathscr{H}$ is a unit vector which spans the range of A, then for all unit vector $\eta \in \mathscr{H}$ there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $A\eta = \lambda\xi$. Then, since $\|A\eta\|_{\mathscr{H}} = \|\lambda\xi\|_{\mathscr{H}} \leqslant \|A\|_{B(\mathscr{H})}$, we have $|\lambda| \leqslant \|A\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})}$, and thus:

$$\|(T_n - T)A\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} \leqslant \|A\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})}\|(T_n - T)\xi\|_{\mathscr{H}} \overset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Of course, Equation (3.8) holds if $A = 0$ as well.

Let A now be an arbitrary compact operator, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists a finite rank operator A_ε on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that:

$$\|A - A_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} < \frac{1}{2M}\varepsilon.$$

Since A_ε is finite rank, by Equation (3.8) (and a trivial induction), there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geqslant N$ we have:

$$\|(T_n - T)A_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} \leqslant \frac{1}{2M}\varepsilon.$$

Thus, for $n \geqslant N$:

$$\begin{aligned}\|(T_n - T)A\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} &\leqslant \|T_n - T\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})}\|A - A_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} + \|(T_n - T)A_\varepsilon\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon = \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

This proves our first implication. Our second implication is trivial, since trace-class operators are compact. Last, if (3) is assumed, then in particular, for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathscr{H}$, if we set A to the be projection on the span of ξ, then $\|(T - T_n)A\|_{\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H})} = \|(T - T_n)\xi\|_{\mathscr{H}}$, and this is enough to conclude that $(T_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in the strong operator topology to T as desired. ☐

Corollary 3.29. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d$ and T be a compact operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Let $(k_n,\sigma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in Ξ^d converging to (k,σ). If $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, then the sequence $(\pi_{k_n,\sigma_n}(v_{k_n}(f))\,T)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in norm to $\pi_{k,\sigma}(v_k(f))\,T$.*

Proof. Apply Lemma (3.28) to Theorem (3.26). ☐

Theorem (3.26) can be used to show that for $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, the map $(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d \mapsto \|\pi_{k,\sigma}(v_k(f))\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d}$ is lower semi-continuous. We proved, in fact, that this map is continuous in [20, Theorem 2.6], which is an essential building block for our current work as well.

Theorem 3.30 ([20]). *Let $(k_n,\sigma_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in Ξ^d converging to some $(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d$. If $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ then $(\|\pi_{\sigma_n}(v_{k_n}(f))\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\|\pi_{k,\sigma}(v_k(f))\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d}$.*

Though Theorem (3.26) only asserts pointwise continuity for the norms, we can actually improve the situation by restricting our attention to finite dimensional subspaces. The following lemma can be found as the first part of [40, Lemma 10.1], and we include its proof for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 3.31. *Let m be a norm on a subspace V of $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. For all $(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d$, we assume given a norm $\mathsf{n}_{k,\sigma}$ of V dominated by m and such that, for all $v \in V$, the map $(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d \mapsto \|v_k(v)\|_{k,\sigma}$ is continuous. Then:*

$$(k,\sigma,v) \in \Xi^d \times V \longmapsto \mathsf{n}_{k,\sigma}(v_k(v)) \tag{3.9}$$

is continuous, when V is endowed with the norm m and $\Xi^d \times V$ with the product topology.

Proof. For any $(k,\sigma),(c,\theta) \in \Xi^d$ and $a,b \in V$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(b) - \mathsf{n}_{k,\sigma}(a)| &\leqslant |\mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(b) - \mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(a)| + |\mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(a) - \mathsf{n}_{k,\sigma}(a)|\\ &\leqslant \mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(b-a) + |\mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(a) - \mathsf{n}_{k,\sigma}(a)|\\ &\leqslant \mathsf{m}(b-a) + |\mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(a) - \mathsf{n}_{k,\sigma}(a)|.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By assumption, there exists an open neighborhood U of (k,σ) in Ξ^d such that, for all $(c,\theta) \in U$, we have:

$$|\mathsf{n}_{c,\theta}(a) - \mathsf{n}_{k,\sigma}(a)| < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon.$$

Thus, if U_2 is the open ball of center a and radius $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$ for the norm m, we then have that for all $(c,\theta,b) \in U \times U_2$:

$$|\mathsf{n}_\theta(b) - \mathsf{n}_\sigma(a)| < \varepsilon,$$

as desired. ☐

Corollary 3.32. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$. The map:*

$$(k, \sigma, f) \in \Xi^d \times \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d) \longmapsto \|\pi_{c,\theta}(v_k(f))\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d}$$

is continuous when $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is endowed with $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\Xi^d \times \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ with the product topology.

Proof. Apply Lemma (3.31) to the field of norms given by Theorem (3.26), where V is indeed finite dimensional, and where $\mathsf{m} = \|\cdot\|_1$. □

In practice, Corollary (3.32) will be used when we restrict our attention to a finite dimensional subspace of $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Using the continuity of the norms, as well as the definition of Lip-norms, we proved in [20, Proposition 3.10] a result concerning the continuity of Lip-norms, which we shall need for our work as well. Putting it together with Lemma (3.31), we have:

Theorem 3.33. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and S be a finite set in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ which does not contain 0. Define:*

$$V = \{f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d) : \forall n \notin S \quad f(n) = 0\}.$$

Then V is a finite dimensional subspace of $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Let l be a continuous length function on $\mathbb{U}^d$. The map:

$$(k, \sigma, f) \in \Xi^d \times V \longmapsto \mathsf{L}_{l,k,\sigma}(v_k(f))$$

is continuous.

Proof. By [20, Proposition 3.10], for a fixed $f \in V$, the function $(k, \sigma) \in \Xi^d \mapsto \mathsf{L}_{k,\sigma}(v_k(f))$ is continuous. Now, for any $f \in V$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{U}^d$, we set:

$$\alpha^\omega(f) : n \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mapsto \omega^n f(n).$$

We see that α thus defined is an ergodic action of $\mathbb{U}^d$ on $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. For any $f \in V$, we set:

$$\mathsf{m} = \sup\left\{ \frac{\|f - \alpha^\omega(f)\|_1}{l(\omega)} : \omega \in \mathbb{U}^d \right\}.$$

By construction, for all $(k, \sigma, f) \in \Xi^d \times V$ we have $\mathsf{L}_{l,k,\sigma}(f) \leqslant \mathsf{m}(f)$. Indeed, we note that by Theorem-Definition (3.12) that the dual action $\alpha_{k,\sigma}$ restricted to $\mathbb{U}_k^d$ and α agree when applied to elements in $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and thus in particular to V.

Moreover, m is a norm on V — this last step uses the finite dimensionality of V, since one checks that m is finite on the canonical basis for V consisting of the indicator functions of the singletons of S, and thus m takes finite values on V (as m is a seminorm and V finite dimensional). Thus Lemma (3.31) applies to give our theorem. □

Finite dimensionality and the exclusion of 0 from the support of the elements of V is used in Theorem (3.33) so that we can find a norm which dominates all the Lip-norms; in general $\mathsf{m}(f)$, as defined in the proof of Theorem (3.33), for $f \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, is neither finite nor zero only at zero, and thus does not define a norm.

3.3. **Quantum Propinquity and Quantum Tori.** We have now reached the moment when we can establish our main example of convergence for the quantum propinquity. We shall build a trek of a single bridge, with $\mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d))$ as our bridge C*-algebra, the various representations $\pi_{k,\sigma}$ ($(k,\sigma) \in \Xi^d$) as our unital *-mono-morphisms, and elements of the following form as our pivot element in $\mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d))$.

Notation 3.34. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$. Let $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be a family of complex numbers indexed by $\mathbb{Z}^d$. The operator $\mathrm{Diag}\left[\lambda_n \middle| n \in \mathbb{Z}^d\right]$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is defined by setting for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:

$$\mathrm{Diag}\left[\lambda \middle| n \in \mathbb{Z}^d\right] e_n = \lambda_n e_n,$$

where $(e_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is the canonical Hilbert basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ defined in Notation (3.22).

Notation 3.35. For any $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and any $n = (n_1, \ldots, n_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define:

$$|n| = \sum_{j=1}^{d} |n_j|.$$

We note that $|\cdot|$ thus defined is the length function on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ associated with the canonical generators of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Thus, in particular, for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have $||n| - |m|| \leqslant |n - m| \leqslant |n| + |m|$.

Notation 3.36. For any $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, and for any $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_d) \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$, we denote by $\vee k$ the element of $\overline{\mathbb{N}}_*$ defined as:

$$\wedge k = \min\{|n| : n \notin I_k\} = \min\left\{ \left\lceil \frac{k_j - 1}{2} \right\rceil : j = 1, \ldots, d \right\} + 1.$$

Notation 3.37. Let $M, N \in \mathbb{N}_*$ be given. We define, for all $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$:

$$w_{N,M} : n \in \mathbb{Z}^d \longmapsto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |n| \leqslant N, \\ 1 - \frac{M+N-|n|}{M} & \text{if } N \leqslant |n| \leqslant M + N, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The proper choice of a bridge for a given pair of quantum tori, or a pair of a fuzzy torus with a quantum torus, will depend on the following estimate.

Theorem 3.38. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $k \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$, and σ a skew-bicharacter of Z_k^d. Let $N, M \in \mathbb{N}_*$ such that $N + M < \wedge k$. Define, using Notation (3.37):*

$$\omega_{N,M} = \mathrm{Diag}\left[w_{N,M}(n) \middle| n \in \mathbb{Z}^d\right].$$

Then $\omega_{N,M}$ is a finite rank operator such that, for all $m \in I_k \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have:

$$\left\| \left[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(\delta_{q_k(m)}\right)\right] \right\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \leqslant \frac{|m|}{M},$$

where $q_k : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{Z}_k^d$ is the canonical surjection.

Proof. Let $m \in I_k$. Let $v_k : \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d_k)$ be given by Lemma (3.23). An easy computation shows that $v_k(\delta_m) = \delta_{q_k(m)}$, and moreover, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:

$$\pi_{\sigma,k}(v_k(\delta_m))e_r = \sigma(m,r)e_{[r-m \mod I_k]+[r|I_k]}. \tag{3.10}$$

by Equation (3.6) in the proof of Theorem (3.26).

We thus easily compute that, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:

$$\left[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(\delta_{q_k(m)}\right)\right] e_n = \sigma(m,n) \\ (w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k] + [n|I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n))\, e_{[n-m \mod I_k]+[n|I_k]}.$$

Using Notation (3.37), we first observe that if $n \notin I_k$, then, $[n-m \mod I_k] + [n|I_k] \notin I_k$ either, and thus we have:

$$w_{N,M}(n) = w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k] + [n|I_k]) = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

since $|n|$ and $|[n|I_k] + [n \mod I_k]|$ are both greater than $\wedge k$, and thus greater than $N+M$.

We now work now with $n \in I_k$ (so $[n|I_k] = 0$). Let $j \in \{1,\ldots,d\}$ and write $n = (n_1,\ldots,n_d)$, $m = (m_1,\ldots,m_d)$,$k = (k_1,\ldots,k_d)$. We have the following cases:

- If $n_j - m_j \in I_{k_j}$ then $\left[n_j - m_j \mod I_{k_j}\right] = n_1 - m_j$, so:
  $$||[n_j - m_j \mod I_{k_1}]| - |n_j|| = ||n_j - m_j| - |n_j|| \leqslant |m_j|.$$
- If $n_j - m_j < \frac{-k_j}{2}$ then:
  $$\left|\left[n_j - m_j \mod I_{k_j}\right]\right| = n_j - m_j + k_j.$$
  Then $2n_j - 2m_j < -k_j$, so $k_j - m_j + 2n_j \leqslant m_j$. On the other hand, note that since $n_j, m_j \in I_{k_j}$ and $n_j - m_j < \frac{-k_j}{2}$, we must have $n_j \leqslant 0$ and $m_j \geqslant 0$; thus:
  $$\left|\left|\left[n_j - m_j \mod I_{k_j}\right]\right| - |n_j|\right| = n_j - m_j + k_j + n_j = 2n_j - m_j + k_j \leqslant m_j = |m_j|.$$
- Similarly, $n_j - m_j \geqslant \frac{k_j}{2}$, then we get:
  $$\left|\left[n_j - m_j \mod I_{k_j}\right]\right| = k_j - n_j + m_j,$$
  while $2n_j - 2m_j \geqslant k_j$, i.e. $2n_j - m_j - k_j \geqslant -m_j$. In this case, we must have $n_j \geqslant 0$ and $m_j \leqslant 0$; thus:
  $$\left|\left|\left[n_j - m_j \mod I_{k_j}\right]\right| - |n_j|\right| = k_j - n_j + m_j - n_j = -2n_j + m_j + k_j \leqslant -m_j = |m_j|.$$

Thus, we always have, for all $n, m \in I_k$:

$$||[n-m \mod I_k]| - |n|| \leqslant |m|. \tag{3.12}$$

Consequently, by Notation (3.37) and Equations (3.11), (3.12), we have the following cases:

- If $\{|n|, |[n-m \mod I_k]|\} \subseteq \{0,\ldots,N\} \cup \{N+M, \infty\}$ then:
  $$|w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n)| = 0 \leqslant \frac{|m|}{M}.$$

- If $\{|n|, |[n-m \mod I_k]|\} \subseteq \{N, \ldots, M+N\}$ then:
$$\begin{aligned}|w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n)| &= \left|\frac{|n| - |[n-m \mod I_k]|}{M}\right| \\ &\leqslant \frac{|m|}{M}.\end{aligned}$$
- If $0 \leqslant |n| \leqslant N$ and $N \leqslant [n-m \mod I_k] \leqslant N+M$ then:
$$\begin{aligned}|w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n)| &= 1 - \frac{N+M-|[n-m \mod I_k]|}{M} \\ &\leqslant \frac{|[n-m \mod I_k]| - N}{M} \\ &\leqslant \frac{|[n-m \mod I_k]| - |n|}{M} \leqslant \frac{|m|}{M}.\end{aligned}$$
- The same computation as above shows that if $|[n-m \mod I_k]| \leqslant N$ and $N \leqslant |n| \leqslant M$, then again:
$$|w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n)| \leqslant \frac{|m|}{M}.$$
- Assume now that $|n| \geqslant N+M$ while $N \leqslant |[n-m \mod I_k]| \leqslant N+M$. Then:
$$\begin{aligned}|w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n)| &= \frac{M+N-|[n-m \mod I_k]|}{M} \\ &\leqslant \frac{|n| - |[n-m \mod I_k]|}{M} \leqslant \frac{|m|}{M}.\end{aligned}$$
- A similar computation shows that if $N \leqslant |n| \leqslant M$ and $|[n-m \mod I_k]| \geqslant M+N$ then:
$$|w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n)| \leqslant \frac{|m|}{M}.$$
- Last, if either $|n| \leqslant N$ and $|[n-m \mod I_k]| \geqslant N+M$ or $|n| \geqslant N+M$ and $|[n-m \mod I_k] \leqslant N$ then:
$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|m|}{M} &\geqslant \frac{||n| - |[n-m \mod I_k]||}{M} \\ &\geqslant 1 = |w_{N,M}([n-m \mod I_k]) - w_{N,M}(n)|.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Equation (3.10), for all $n, m \in I_k$ we have:
$$\left\| \left[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(\delta_{q_k(m)}\right)\right] e_n \right\|_2 \leqslant \frac{|m|}{M},$$
while for all $m \in I_k, n \notin I_k$ we have:
$$\left\| \left[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(\delta_{q_k(m)}\right))\right] e_n \right\|_2 = 0.$$

Let $\xi = (\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Then for all $m \in I_k$ we have, using the Pythagorean Theorem (as $\left[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{k,\sigma}\left(\delta_{q_k(m)}\right)\right]$ maps the canonical basis to an orthogonal family by Equation (3.6)):

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\| \Big[\omega_{N,M}\pi_{k,\sigma}(\delta_{q_k(m)}\Big]\, \xi\Big\|_2^2 &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |\xi_n|^2 \Big\| \Big[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{k,\sigma}\Big(\delta_{q_k(m)}\Big))\Big]\, e_n \Big\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{n\in I_k} |\xi_n|^2 \Big\| \Big[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{k,\sigma}\Big(\delta_{q_k(m)}\Big))\Big]\, e_n \Big\|_2^2 \\ &\leqslant \sum_{n\in I_k} |\xi_n|^2 \left(\frac{|m|^2}{M^2}\right) \leqslant \left(\frac{|m|^2}{M^2}\right) \|\xi\|_2^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Hence our result is proven. ☐

We are now almost ready for the main result of this section. As its proof is rather long, we isolate a lemma which will prove useful in our construction

Lemma 3.39. *For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let P_N be the projection on the span of $\{e_n : |n| \leqslant N\}$ in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, where $(e_m)_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is the canonical Hilbert basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. For any positive trace class operator A on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ with trace 1, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a positive trace class operator B of trace 1 such that $P_N B P_N = B$ and $\|A - B\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} < \varepsilon$. Note that for such an N, ε and B, we have $P_n B P_n = B$ for all $n \geqslant N$ since, $P_N P_n = P_N$.*

Proof. For any pair of vectors $\zeta, \chi \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, we denote the inner product of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ of ζ and χ as $\langle \zeta, \chi\rangle$.

Since A is a positive compact operator, let $(\xi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that:

$$A = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \lambda_n \langle \cdot, \xi_n\rangle \xi_n,$$

where $\lambda_n \in [0,1]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \lambda_n = 1$.

Let $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be chosen so that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d:|n|\geqslant m} \lambda_n < \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon$ for all $m \geqslant N_1$. Let:

$$A' = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d:|n|\leqslant N_1} \lambda_n \langle \cdot, \xi_n\rangle \xi_n.$$

By construction:

$$\|A - A'\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that, for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $|m| \leqslant N_1$, we have:

$$\|P_N\xi_m - \xi_m\|_2 \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{8}, \tag{3.13}$$

which can be found since $\{\xi_m : m \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and } |m| \leqslant N_1\}$ is finite and $(P_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to the identity in the strong operator topology.

Let:

$$\eta_m = P_N\xi_m = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d:|n|\leqslant N} \langle \xi_m, e_n\rangle e_n$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $|m| \leqslant N_1$.

Define:

$$A'' = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^d : |m|\leqslant N_1} \lambda_m \langle \cdot, \eta_m\rangle \eta_m,$$

and note that A'', as the sum of positive operators, is a positive operator; moreover A'' is a finite rank operator such that $P_N A'' P_N = A''$.

We now have:

$$\begin{aligned}\|A - A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} &\leqslant \|A - A'\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} + \|A' - A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}\\ &\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \left\| \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d:|n|\leqslant N_1} \lambda_n \left(\langle\cdot,\xi_n\rangle\xi_n - \langle\cdot,\eta_n\rangle\eta_n\right)\right\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}\\ &\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d:|n|\leqslant N_1} \lambda_n \left(\|\langle\cdot,\xi_n - \eta_n\rangle\xi_n\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} + \|\langle\cdot,\eta_n\rangle(\xi_n-\eta_n)\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Now, for any $\chi, \zeta \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, we have $(\langle\cdot,\chi\rangle\zeta)^* = \langle\cdot,\zeta\rangle\chi$, so that:

$$|\langle\cdot,\chi\rangle\zeta| = \|\chi\|_2\|\zeta\|_2 \left\langle \cdot, \frac{\zeta}{\|\zeta\|_2}\right\rangle \frac{\zeta}{\|\zeta\|_2},$$

so:

$$\|\langle\cdot,\chi\rangle\zeta\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} = \|\chi\|_2\|\zeta\|_2. \tag{3.15}$$

From Inequations (3.13),(3.14), and (3.15), we conclude:

$$\|A - A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} \leqslant \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon + \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^d:|n|\leqslant N_1} \lambda_n\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{8}+\frac{\varepsilon}{8}\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon.$$

To conclude, let $B = \frac{1}{\|A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}} A''$. Now, B satisfies $P_N B P_N = B$ as A'' does, and since A'' is positive, so is B. Moreover, $\mathrm{tr}(B) = \|B\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} = 1$ as, again, B is positive.

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned}\|A - B\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} &\leqslant \|A - A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} + \left\|A'' - \frac{1}{\|A\|''}A''\right\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}\\ &\leqslant \|A - A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} + |1 - \|A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}|\\ &= \|A - A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} + |\|A\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} - \|A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}|\\ &\leqslant 2\|A - A''\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} \leqslant \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes our lemma. □

We now establish the fundamental example of this paper:

Theorem 3.40. *Let* $d \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0,1\}$ *and* σ *a skew-bicharacter of* $\mathbb{Z}^d$. *Write* $\infty^d = (\infty,\ldots,\infty) \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}_*^d$. *Let* l *be a continuous length function on* $\mathbb{U}^d$. *Then:*

$$\lim_{(c,\theta)\to(\infty^d,\sigma)} \Lambda\left(\left(C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_c,\theta\right), \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}\right), \left(C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}^d,\sigma\right),\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}\right)\right) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. By Theorem (3.16), there exists $\phi : \mathbb{U}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and an open neighborhood $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Xi^d$ of (∞^d,σ) in Ξ^d such that:

(1) For all $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$ and for all $a\in\mathfrak{sa}(C^*(\mathbb{Z}^d_c,\theta))$ we have:

$$\|a-\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a)\|_{c,\theta}\leqslant\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a)\text{ and }\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a))\leqslant\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a),$$

(2) There exists a finite subset S of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ containing 0 such that, for all $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$, the restriction of the canonical surjection $q_c:\mathbb{Z}^d\rightarrow\mathbb{Z}^d_c$ is injective on S while the range of $\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}$ is the span of $\{U^p_{c,\theta}:p\in q_c(S)\}$.

Since Ξ^d is compact, we assume that Ω_0 is chosen to be a compact neighborhood of (∞^d,σ), shrinking it if necessary.

Let $V=\{f\in\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d):\forall n\notin S\quad f(n)=0\}$. By construction, V is a finite dimensional subspace of $\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}$. Let:

$$K=\max\{|m|:m\in S\}.\tag{3.16}$$

Now, for all $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$, we note that the dual action $\alpha_{c,\theta}$ of $\mathbb{U}^d_c$ on $\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}$ given by Theorem-Definition (3.12) leaves V invariant. By [31, Proposition 2.2], the vetor space of elements v in V with $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(v)<\infty$ is dense in V, and thus is V as any subspace of V is closed since V is finite dimensional. We thus conclude that $V\subseteq\operatorname{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta})$ for all $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$.

Now, let E be the kernel of the linear map on V defined by $f\in V\mapsto f(0)$ (note that this map is, in fact, the restriction of the tracial state on $\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}$ for any $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$). Thus, E is a complementary subspace of $\mathbb{R}\delta_0$ in V — note that $v_c(\delta_0)$ is the unit of $\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}$ for all $(c,\theta)\in\Xi^d$. Let Σ be the unit *sphere* in E for the norm $\|\cdot\|_1$.

As an important change of notation, to improve the readability of the following computations, we note that since q_c restricted to S is injective, Lemma (3.23) implies that v_c is an injection for all $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$, which in turn allows us to identity V with a subset of $\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}$ for $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$ and drop the notation v_c with no confusion. We shall thus do so.

By Corollary (3.32) and Theorem (3.33), as E is a finite dimensional subspace of $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, the functions $\mathrm{lf}:(f,c,\theta)\in\Sigma\times\Omega_0\mapsto\mathsf{L}_{c,\theta}(f)$ is jointly continuous. Since $\Sigma\times\Omega_0$ is compact, the function lf has a minimum on $\Sigma\times\Omega_0$. We set:

$$y=\min_{\Sigma\times\Omega_0}\mathrm{lf}.\tag{3.17}$$

By assumptions on Lip-norms and since Σ contains no scalar multiple of the unit of any $\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}$ for any $(c,\theta)\in\Xi^d$, the real number y of lf is strictly positive.

We now need some facts about continuous fields of states. Let $\mathsf{l}_{c,\theta}$ be the restriction of $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}$ to E for all $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0$. Since $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(v)=0$ implies that $v\in\mathbb{R}\delta_0$ for any $v\in V$ by definition of Lip-norms, and since we saw that $V\subseteq\operatorname{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta})$, we conclude that $\mathsf{l}_{c,\theta}$ is a norm on E. Let $\mathsf{l}^*_{c,\theta}$ be the dual norm of $\mathsf{l}_{c,\theta}$, defined on the dual E^* of E, i.e.:

$$\forall\mu\in E^*\quad\mathsf{l}^*_{c,\theta}(\mu)=\sup\{|\mu(v)|:v\in E\text{ and }\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(v)\leqslant 1\}.$$

One checks that for all $v\in E$, the map $(c,\theta)\in\Omega_0\mapsto\mathsf{l}^*_{c,\theta}(v)$ is continuous, since $(c,\theta,v)\in\Omega\times E\mapsto\mathsf{l}_{c,\theta}(v)$ is jointly continuous and by [40, Lemma 10.1]. As also shown in [40, Lemma 10.1], there exists a norm $\|\cdot\|^*$ on the dual E^* of E

such that, for all $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_0$, we have $\mathsf{l}^*_{c,\theta} \leqslant \|\cdot\|^*$. Now, since E^* is finite dimensional, and $\mathsf{l}^*_{\infty^d,\sigma}$ and $\|\cdot\|^*$ are norms on E^*, there exists a constant $k \geqslant 1$ such that $\|\cdot\|^* \leqslant k\mathsf{l}^*_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(\cdot)$. It is important to take note that by Definition (2.6), we have $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}}(\mu,\nu) \geqslant \mathsf{l}^*_{c,\theta}(\mu-\nu)$ for any $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_0$ and $\mu,\nu \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta})$, where we denote the restrictions of μ and ν by the same letters.

Now, let $\mathfrak{L}_1^{1+}$ be the set of all positive trace class operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ of trace 1. For any $A \in \mathfrak{L}_1^{1+}$, we define:

$$\psi_A : T \in \mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)) \longmapsto \mathrm{tr}(AT).$$

By [9, Proposition VII 5.2], since $\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}$ is faithful, the set:

$$\{\psi_A \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma} : A \in \mathfrak{L}_1^{1+}\}$$

is a weak* dense subset of $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma})$. Since $\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}}$ metrizes the weak* topology of $\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma})$, and this space is compact, there exists a *finite* subset $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathfrak{L}_1^{1+}$ such that, for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A})$, there exists $A \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that:

$$\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}}(\varphi, \psi_A \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{12k}. \tag{3.18}$$

Let $D = \mathrm{diam}\left(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}), \mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}}\right)$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let P_N the projection on the span of $\{e_j : |j| \leqslant N\}$ in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. By Lemma (3.39), since $\mathfrak{F}$ is finite, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite set $\mathfrak{F}_N$ such that:

- for all $A \in \mathfrak{F}$, there exists $B \in \mathfrak{F}_N$ such that $\|A - B\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{12kD}$,
- For all $B \in \mathfrak{F}_N$, we have $P_N B P_N = B P_N = P_N B = B$.

Let $A \in \mathfrak{F}$, and choose $B \in \mathfrak{F}_N$ such that $\|A-B\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{12kD}$. Let $a \in \mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}$ with $\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a) \leqslant 1$. By [32], there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|a + t1\|_{\infty^d,\sigma} \leqslant D$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_A \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a) - \psi_B \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a)| &= |\psi_A \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a+t1) - \psi_B \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a+t1)| \\
&= |\mathrm{tr}((A-B)\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a+t1))| \\
&\leqslant \|(A-B)\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a+t1)\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1} \\
&\leqslant \|A-B\|_{\mathfrak{L}_1}\|a+t1\|_{\infty^d,\sigma} \\
&\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{12kD} D = \frac{\varepsilon}{12k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Thus, we conclude from Inequations (3.18) and (3.19):

$$\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}), \{\psi_A \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma} : A \in \mathfrak{F}_N\}) \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{6k}.$$

In particular, for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{\infty,\sigma})$, there exists $A \in \mathfrak{F}_N$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi - \psi_{\mathfrak{A}} \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}\|^* &\leqslant k\mathsf{l}^*_{\infty^d,\sigma}(\varphi - \psi_{\mathfrak{A}} \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}) \\
&\leqslant k\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}}(\varphi, \psi \circ \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}) \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{6},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where we used the same names for φ and $\psi_{\mathfrak{A}} \circ \pi_{k,\sigma}$ and their restrictions to E.

For all $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_0$, the space V is identified with a subspace of $\mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta})$ containing the unit, and thus V is endowed with an order-unit space structure associated with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{c,\theta}$; let $\mathscr{S}(V|c,\theta)$ be the state space of V with this order-unit space structure. Note that the unit is always δ_0 for all $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_0$, and thus we will omit it from our notations.

By Lemma (3.31), for any $v \in V$, the function $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_0 \mapsto \|v\|_{c,\theta}$ is continuous (using $m = \|\cdot\|_1$, in the notations of Lemma (3.31)). Moreover, for each $A \in \mathfrak{L}_1{}^{1+}$ and $v \in V$, the function:

$$(c,\theta) \in \Omega_0 \longmapsto \psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}(v)$$

is continuous, by Lemma (3.28) and Theorem (3.26).

By [40, Lemma 10.11], there exists a compact neighborhood $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega_0$ of (∞^d,σ) such that, for all $(c,\sigma) \in \Omega_1$, and for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(V|c,\theta)$, there exists $A \in \mathfrak{F}_N$ such that:

$$\|\varphi - \psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}\|^* \leqslant \frac{3\varepsilon}{6},$$

where, by a slight abuse of notations, we identified the states $\psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}$ and φ with their restrictions to E.

Let $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_1$. Since $\mathsf{l}^*_{c,\theta} \leqslant \|\cdot\|^*$ on E^*, and since all states map the unit to 1, we conclude that, for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(V|c,\theta)$, there exists $A \in \mathfrak{F}_N$ such that:

$$\sup\{|\varphi(a) - \psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}(a)| : a \in V \text{ and } \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a) \leqslant 1\} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{3.21}$$

The expression in the left hand-side of Inequation (3.21) is the Monge-Kantorovich metric on $\mathscr{S}(V|c,\theta)$ associated with the restriction of $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}$ to V; we shall not need to worry about introducing a notation for this.

Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta})$. There exists $A \in \mathfrak{F}_N$ such that Inequation (3.21) holds. Now, for any $a \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta})$ with $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a) \leqslant 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}|\varphi(a) - \psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}(a)| &\leqslant |\varphi(a) - \varphi(\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a))| + |\varphi \circ \alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a) - \psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}(\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a))| \\ &\quad + |\psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}(\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a)) - \psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta}(a)| \\ &\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4},\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a)) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a)$ and $\alpha^{\phi}_{c,\theta}(a) \in V$.

So we conclude that for all $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_1$, we have:

$$\mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{mk}_{\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}}}(\mathscr{S}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}), \{\psi_A \circ \pi_{c,\theta} : A \in \mathfrak{F}_N\}) \leqslant \varepsilon. \tag{3.22}$$

Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be chosen so that $\frac{K}{M} < \frac{\varepsilon y}{4}$, with y defined by Equation (3.17) and K defined by Equation (3.16). We define, using Notation (3.37) as in Theorem (3.38):

$$\omega_{N,M} = \mathrm{Diag}\left[w_{N,M}(n)\middle| n \in \mathbb{Z}^d\right].$$

Note that the 1-level of $\omega_{N,M}$ thus chosen contains $\{\psi_A : A \in \mathfrak{F}_N\}$ since by construction, $P_N\omega_N = \omega_N P_N = P_N$, so by definition $(\mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)), \omega_{N,M}, \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}, \pi_{c,\theta})$ is a bridge from $\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}$ to $\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}$.

Let $\Omega_2 \subseteq \Omega_1$ be a compact neighborhood of (∞^d,σ) such that, for all $(c,\theta) \in \Omega_2$, we have $N + M \leqslant \wedge c$.

By Theorem (3.33), together with Lemma (3.31), choosing $\|\cdot\|_1$ for m, we see that the map:

$$\mathrm{df} : (f, c, \theta) \in \Sigma \times \Omega_2 \longmapsto |\mathsf{L}_{c,\theta}(f) - \mathsf{L}_{\infty^d,\sigma}(f)|$$

is jointly continuous. Similarly, by Corollary (3.29), and using the same method as used in the proof of Lemma (3.31), the map:

$$\mathrm{cf} : (f, c, \theta) \in V \times \Omega_2 \longmapsto \|(\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(v_k(f)) - \pi_{c,\theta}(v_c(f)))\omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d}$$

is jointly continuous. Thus cf and df are uniformly continuous on the compact $\Sigma \times \Omega_2$. We can therefore find a compact neighborhood Ω of (∞^d, σ) in Ω_2 such that, for all $(c, \theta) \in \Omega$, and for all $f \in \Sigma$, we have:

$$\begin{cases} \|(\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(v_k(f)) - \pi_{c,\theta}(v_c(f)))\omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} < \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon y, \\ |\mathsf{L}_{\infty^d,\sigma}(f) - \mathsf{L}_{c,\theta}(f)| < \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon y^2. \end{cases}$$

We now prove that, for all $(c, \theta) \in \Omega$, we have:

$$\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}, \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}), (\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}, \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta})) \leqslant \varepsilon,$$

which will prove our theorem.

Let $(c, \theta) \in \Omega$. The bridge we wish to consider is given by:

$$\gamma = \left(\mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)), \omega_{N,M}, \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}, \pi_{c,\theta}\right).$$

By construction:

$$\psi_A((1_{\mathfrak{B}^d} - \omega_{N,M})^*(1_{\mathfrak{B}^d} - \omega_{N,M})) = \psi_A((1_{\mathfrak{B}^d} - \omega_{N,M})(1_{\mathfrak{B}^d} - \omega_{N,M})^*) = 0$$

for all $A \in \mathfrak{F}_N$. Thus, by Inequations (3.22) and Definition (2.37), we have the following bound on the height of γ:

$$\varsigma\left(\gamma \middle| \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}, \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}\right) \leqslant \varepsilon. \tag{3.23}$$

It remains to compute the reach of the bridge γ.

Let $a \in \Sigma \subseteq \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma})$, and note that $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a) > 0$ by definition of Σ. Set:

$$b = \frac{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a)}{\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a)} a.$$

By construction, $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(b) = \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a)$.

Now, using Theorem (3.38), since for all $(c, \theta) \in \Omega$ we have $N + M \leqslant \wedge c$, we have for all $d = \sum_{n \in S} \lambda_n \delta_n \in \Sigma$, with $(\lambda_n)_{n \in S}$ a family of scalar:

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{c,\theta}(d)]\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} &\leqslant \sum_{m \in S} |\lambda_m| \|[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{c,\theta}(\delta_m)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\ &\leqslant \sum_{m \in S} |\lambda_m| \frac{K}{M} \\ &\leqslant \frac{K}{M} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon y}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

since, again by definition of Σ as the unit sphere in E for $\|\cdot\|_1$, we have $\sum_{m\in S}|\lambda_m| = 1$.

We thus have, using $\|\omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a)\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} &\leqslant \|[\omega_{N,M}, \pi_{c,\theta}(b)]\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\
&\quad + \|(\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a) - \pi_{c,\theta}(b))\omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\
&\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon y}{4} + \|(\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a) - \pi_{c,\theta}(a))\omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\
&\quad + \|(\pi_{c,\theta}(a) - \pi_{c,\theta}(b))\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\
&\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{4}y + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}y + \left|1 - \frac{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a)}{\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a)}\right| \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a) + \frac{|\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a) - \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a)|}{\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a)} \\
&\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a) + \frac{\varepsilon y}{4} \\
&\leqslant \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let $a = a' + t1_{\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}} \in V$ with $a' \in \Sigma$. A quick computation shows that, if $b' = \frac{\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a')}{\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(a')}a'$ and $b = b' + t1_{\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}}$, then:

(3.24)
$$\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(b) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a) \text{ and } \|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a)\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \leqslant \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a).$$

Now, let $d \in V$ and let $a \in E$ with $d - a \in \mathbb{R}\delta_0$. Let $r = \|a\|_1$. If $r = 0$, then $d = t1_{\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}}$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and we check easily that if $e = t1_{\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}}$ then we have $\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(d) = \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(e) (= 0)$ and $\|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(d)\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(e)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} = 0$.

Otherwise, pick $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta})$ given by Equation (3.24) for $a = r^{-1}d$, and set $e = rc$. Then again, by homogeneity:

(3.25)
$$\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(e) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(d) \text{ and } \|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(d)\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(e)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \leqslant \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(d).$$

Last, let $a \in \mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}$. let $a' = \alpha^{\phi}_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a)$. Since $a' \in V$, there exists, by Equation (3.25), an element $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta})$ such that:

$$\begin{cases} \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(b) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a') \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a) \text{ and} \\ \|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a')\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \leqslant \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a'). \end{cases} \tag{3.26}$$

Then we have (again, using $\|\omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned}\|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a)\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} &\leqslant \| \left(\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a) - \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a')\right) \omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\ &\quad + \|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a')\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\ &\leqslant \| \left(\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a) - \pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a')\right) \|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a) \text{ as } \|\omega_{N,M}\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} = 1, \\ &\leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\mathsf{L}_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a) + \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}\mathsf{L}_{k,\sigma}(a) \leqslant \varepsilon\mathsf{L}_{k,\sigma}(a).\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, for all $a \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma})$, there exists $b \in \mathfrak{sa}(\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta})$ such that $\mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}(b) \leqslant \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a)$ and:

$$\|\pi_{\infty^d,\sigma}(a)\omega_{N,M} - \omega_{N,M}\pi_{c,\theta}(b)\|_{\mathfrak{B}^d} \leqslant \varepsilon\mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}(a).$$

The above reasoning applies equally well with the roles of (∞^d, σ) and (c, θ) reversed. This proves that:

$$\varrho\left(\gamma \middle| \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}, \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}\right) \leqslant \varepsilon.$$

Together with Equation (3.23), we have thus, by Definition (2.38), that:

$$\lambda\left(\gamma \middle| \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}, \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}\right) \leqslant \varepsilon.$$

Consequently, if $\Gamma = (\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}, \mathsf{L}_{k,\sigma}, \gamma, \mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}, \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta})$ is the canonical trek associated with γ, we have $\lambda(\Gamma) = \lambda\left(\gamma \middle| \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}, \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}\right) \leqslant \varepsilon$, and thus by Definition (2.43) we have:

$$\Lambda((\mathfrak{A}_{\infty^d,\sigma}, \mathsf{L}_{l,\infty^d,\sigma}), (\mathfrak{A}_{c,\theta}, \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta})) \leqslant \varepsilon,$$

as desired. □

Remark 3.41. As the construction of Theorem (3.40) involves a trek with a single bridge, Theorem (3.40) also holds if we replace the quantum propinquity with Rieffel's proximity [36] or with the quantum propinquity specialized to compact C*-metric spaces (or any class of Leibniz quantum compact metric spaces which contain the quantum tori and the fuzzy tori).

Thus, the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity allows one to talk about convergence of fuzzy tori to quantum tori in a stronger sense that in [20]; in particular the convergence preserves the C*-algebra structure, per Theorem (2.52).

We conclude by a remark about continuity for fuzzy tori for the quantum propinquity. The proof of Theorem (3.40) can be adjusted to show that:

$$\lim_{(c,\theta)\to(k,\sigma)} \Lambda\left(\left(C^*\left(Z_c^d, \theta\right), \mathsf{L}_{l,c,\theta}\right), \left(C^*\left(\mathbb{Z}_k^d, \sigma\right), \mathsf{L}_{l,k,\sigma}\right)\right) = 0,$$

if $k \in \mathbb{N}_*^d$, by replacing $\omega_{N,M}$ with the projection on $\operatorname{span}\{e_n : n \in I_k\}$. In fact, the proof is somewhat simpler, as in fact it takes place on the finite dimensional $\operatorname{span}\{e_n : n \in I_k\}$ and does not require Theorem (3.38).

We observe that the use of a bridge of the form $(\mathfrak{B}(\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)), \omega, \pi, \rho)$ with ω a compact operator was essential to take advantage of the strong-operator-topology continuity given by the field of quantum and fuzzy tori. This illustrates the potential to apply the quantum propinquity to a large class of examples. The study of the topological and metric properties of the quantum Gromov-Hausdorff propinquity and of its applications to continuous fields and other examples will be the matter of an upcoming paper.

REFERENCES

1. E. Alfsen and F. Shultz, *State spaces of operator algebras*, Birkhäuser, 2001.
2. M. Barnsley, *Fractals everywhere*, 2nd edition ed., Morgan Kaufmann, 1993, 1998.
3. B. Blackadar and J. Cuntz, *Differential Banach algebra norms and smooth subalgebras of C*–Algebras*, Journal of Operator Theory **26** (1991), no. 2, 255–282.
4. A. Connes, *Compact metric spaces, fredholm modules and hyperfiniteness*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **9** (1989), no. 2, 207–220.
5. ———, *Noncommutative geometry*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1994.
6. A. Connes, M. Douglas, and A. Schwarz, *Noncommutative geometry and matrix theory: Compactification on tori*, JHEP **9802** (1998), hep-th/9711162.
7. R. L. Dobrushin, *Prescribing a system of random variables by conditional probabilities*, Theory of probability and its applications **15** (1970), no. 3, 459–486.
8. G. Elliott and D. Evans, *Structure of the irrational rotation* C^**-algebras*, Annals of Mathematics **138** (1993), 477–501.
9. J. M. G. Fell and R. S. Doran, *Representations of *-algebras, locally compact groups, and Banach *-algebraic bundles*, vol. 1, Academic Press, 1988.
10. V. Gayral, J. M. Graci Bondia, B. Iochum, T. Schücker, and J. C. Varilly, *Moyal planes are spectral triples*, Comm. Math. Phys. **246** (2004), 569–623, ArXiv: hep-th/0307241.
11. M. Gromov, *Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps*, Publications mathématiques de l' I. H. E. S. **53** (1981), 53–78.
12. ———, *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser, 1999.
13. R. Hoegh-Krohn, M. B. Landstad, and E. Stormer, *Compact ergodic groups of automorphisms*, Annals of Mathematics **114** (1981), 75–86.
14. L. V. Kantorovich, *On one effective method of solving certain classes of extremal problems*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. USSR **28** (1940), 212–215.
15. L. V. Kantorovich and G. Sh. Rubinstein, *On the space of completely additive functions*, Vestnik Leningrad Univ., Ser. Mat. Mekh. i Astron. **13** (1958), no. 7, 52–59, In Russian.
16. D. Kerr, *Matricial quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance*, J. Funct. Anal. **205** (2003), no. 1, 132–167, math.OA/0207282.
17. D. Kerr and H. Li, *On Gromov–Hausdorff convergence of operator metric spaces*, J. Oper. Theory **1** (2009), no. 1, 83–109.
18. A. Kleppner, *Multipliers on Abelian groups*, Mathematishen Annalen **158** (1965), 11–34.
19. N. Landsman, *Mathematical topics between classical and quantum mechanics*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1998.
20. F. Latrémolière, *Approximation of the quantum tori by finite quantum tori for the quantum gromov-hausdorff distance*, Journal of Funct. Anal. **223** (2005), 365–395, math.OA/0310214.
21. ———, *Bounded-lipschitz distances on the state space of a C*-algebra*, Tawainese Journal of Mathematics **11** (2007), no. 2, 447–469, math.OA/0510340.
22. ———, *Qauntum locally compact metric spaces*, Journal of Functional Analysis **264** (2013), no. 1, 362–402, ArXiv: 1208.2398.
23. H. Li, C^**-algebraic quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance*, (2003), ArXiv: math.OA/0312003.
24. ———, θ*-deformations as compact quantum metric spaces*, Comm. Math. Phys. **1** (2005), 213–238, ArXiv: math/OA: 0311500.
25. ———, *Order-unit quantum Gromov-Hausdorff distance*, J. Funct. Anal. **233** (2006), no. 2, 312–360.
26. B. Morariu and B. Zumino, *Super yang-mills on the noncomutative torus*, Arnowitt Festschrift **Relativity, Particle Physics, and Cosmology** (1998), hep-th/9807198.

27. Nathan Seiberg and Edward Witten, *String theory and noncommutative geometry*, JHEP **9909** (1999), no. 32, ArXiv: hep-th/9908142.
28. N. Ozawa and M. A. Rieffel, *Hyperbolic group C^*-algebras and free products C^*-algebras as compact quantum metric spaces*, Canad. J. Math. **57** (2005), 1056–1079, ArXiv: math/0302310.
29. M. A. Rieffel, *Projective modules over higher-dimensional non-commutative tori*, Can. J. Math. **XL** (1988), no. 2, 257–338.
30. ______, *Non-commutative tori — a case study of non-commutative differentiable manifolds*, Contemporary Math **105** (1990), 191–211.
31. ______, *Metrics on states from actions of compact groups*, Documenta Mathematica **3** (1998), 215–229, math.OA/9807084.
32. ______, *Metrics on state spaces*, Documenta Math. **4** (1999), 559–600, math.OA/9906151.
33. ______, *Group C^*-algebras as compact quantum metric spaces*, Documenta Mathematica **7** (2002), 605–651, ArXiv: math/0205195.
34. ______, *Matrix algebras converge to the sphere for quantum Gromov–Hausdorff distance*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **168** (2004), no. 796, 67–91, math.OA/0108005.
35. ______, *Distances between matrix alegbras that converge to coadjoint orbits*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **81** (2010), 173–180, ArXiv: 0910.1968.
36. ______, *Leibniz seminorms for "matrix algebras converge to the sphere"*, Clay Math. Proc. **11** (2010), 543–578, ArXiv: 0707.3229.
37. ______, *Vector bundles and gromov-hausdorff distance*, Journal of K-theory **5** (2010), 39–103, ArXiv: math/0608266.
38. ______, *Leibniz seminorms and best approximation from C^*-subalgebras*, Sci China Math **54** (2011), no. 11, 2259–2274, ArXiv: 1008.3773.
39. ______, *Standard deviation is a strongly leibniz seminorm*, Submitted (2012), 24 pages, ArXiv: 1208.4072.
40. ______, *Gromov-Hausdorff distance for quantum metric spaces*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **168** (March 2004), no. 796, math.OA/0011063.
41. G. T'Hooft, *Determinism beneath quantum mechanics*, Presentation at "Quo Vadis Quantum Mechanics?", Temple University, Philadelphia (2002), quant-ph/0212095.
42. L. N. Wasserstein, *Markov processes on a countable product space, describing large systems of automata*, Problemy Peredachi Infomatsii **5** (1969), no. 3, 64–73, In Russian.
43. G. Zeller-Meier, *Produits croisés d'une C*-algèbre par un groupe d' Automorphismes*, J. Math. pures et appl. **47** (1968), no. 2, 101–239.

E-mail address: `frederic@math.du.edu`
URL: `http://www.math.du.edu/~frederic`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER, DENVER CO 80208